arXiv:1412.8732v2 [math.PR] 31 Jul 2015

Parametrix construction of the transition probability density of the solution to an SDE driven by α-stable noise

Victoria Knopova* and Alexei Kulik**

Abstract

Let $L := -a(x)(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2} + (b(x), \nabla)$, where $\alpha \in (0,2)$, and $a : \mathbb{R}^d \to (0,\infty)$, $b : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d$. Under certain regularity assumptions on the coefficients a and b, we associate with the $C_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$-closure of $(L, C^2_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d))$ a Feller Markov process X, which possesses a transition probability density $p_t(x,y)$. To construct this transition probability density and to obtain the two-sided estimates on it, we develop a new version of the parametrix method, which allows us to handle the case $0 < \alpha \le 1$ and $b \neq 0$, i.e. when the gradient part of the generator is not dominated by the jump part.

Keywords: Pseudo-differential operator, generator of a Markov process, transition probability density, martingale problem, SDE, Levi's parametrix method.

MSC 2010: Primary: 60J35. Secondary: 60J75, 35S05, 35S10, 47G30.

1 Introduction

Let $Z^{(\alpha)}$, $\alpha \in (0,2)$, be a symmetric α-stable process in $\mathbb{R}^d$; that is, a Lévy process with

$$\mathbb{E}e^{i(\xi, Z^{(\alpha)}_t)} = e^{-t|\xi|^\alpha}, \quad \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

It is well known that the generator $L^{(\alpha)}$ of the semigroup $(P^{(\alpha)}_t)_{t\ge 0}$, where $P^{(\alpha)}_t f(x) = \mathbb{E}^x f(Z^{(\alpha)}_t)$, admits on $C^2_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ the representation

$$L^{(\alpha)} f(x) = \text{P.V.} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Big(f(x+u) - f(x) \Big) \frac{c_\alpha}{|u|^{d+\alpha}} du. \tag{1.1}$$

Here and below we denote by $C^k_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $k \ge 0$, the space of k times continuously differentiable functions, vanishing at infinity together with their derivatives. Operator $L^{(\alpha)}$ is also called a *fractional Laplacian*, and is denoted by $-(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}$.

*V.M. Glushkov Institute of Cybernetics, NAS of Ukraine, 40, Acad. Glushkov Ave., 03187, Kiev, Ukraine, vic_knopova@gmx.de

**Institute of Mathematics, NAS of Ukraine, 3, Tereshchenkivska str., 01601 Kiev, Ukraine, kulik@imath.kiev.ua

Consider the following "perturbation" of the operator $L^{(\alpha)}$:

$$Lf(x) = a(x)L^{(\alpha)}f(x) + \Big(b(x), \nabla f(x)\Big), \quad f \in C^2_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d). \tag{1.2}$$

where $a(\cdot) > 0$, $b(\cdot) \in \mathbb{R}^d$. When the coefficients $a(\cdot)$ and $b(\cdot)$ do not depend on x, the operator L is just the generator of the semigroup, which corresponds to the Lévy process $Z^{(\alpha)}$ re-scaled by a and with drift $-b$. The general case is much more complicated, and the purpose of this paper is to show that under suitable assumptions on the coefficients and the parameter α, the C_∞-closure of the operator $(L, C^2_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d))$ is the generator of a semigroup $\{P_t, t \geq 0\}$, which corresponds to a strong Markov process.

Our approach is analytical, and mainly relies on the *parametrix construction* of the "candidate" $p_t(x, y)$ for the transition probability density of the required Markov process. We develop a new version of the parametrix construction, which substantially depends on the relation between the regularity of the drift coefficient $b(x)$ and the parameter α and, in particular, allows us to handle the case $0 < \alpha \leq 1$ and $b \neq 0$, i.e. the one where the gradient part of the generator is not dominated by the jump part. To associate the constructed kernel $p_t(x, y)$ with a Markov process in a unique way, we develop a new method, which we believe may be useful in other settings as well. This method relies on the fact that L possesses the positive maximum principle, and exploits a new notion of an *approximate fundamental solution*. We refer the reader for a detailed discussion in Section 2.3, where we also give an overview of available results.

We also consider the probabilistic counterpart to the problem described above. Namely, we consider an SDE driven by $Z^{(\alpha)}$

$$dX_t = b(X_t)\, dt + \sigma(X_{t-})\, dZ^{(\alpha)}_t, \tag{1.3}$$

here and below we denote $\sigma(x) = a^{1/\alpha}(x)$. Using the parametrix construction and the fact that the closure of $(L, C^2_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d))$ is the generator of a Markov process, we show that a weak solution to (1.3) is unique and actually coincides with this Markov process. This fact also ensures that the martingale problem $(L, C^2_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d))$ is well posed.

Finally, using essentially the bounds we construct in order to ensure that the parametrix construction is feasible, we provide lower and upper bounds for the transition probability density $p_t(x, y)$.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we formulate the main results, give the outline of the proofs and an overview of already existing results, comparing them with ours. Section 3 is devoted to the parametrix method for construction of the function $p_t(x, y)$, which is the candidate for being the fundamental solution to the Cauchy problem for $\partial_t - L$. Section 4 is devoted to the connection between the operators P_t and L, in particular, we prove that the family of operators $\{P_t,\, t \geq 0\}$ forms a strongly continuous contraction semigroup on $C_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then we prove that the extension $(A, D(A))$ of $(L, C^2_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d))$ is in fact the generator of the semigroup $\{P_t,\, t \geq 0\}$, and, moreover, that $p_t(\cdot, y) \in D(A)$, and is the fundamental solution to the Cauchy problem for $\partial_t - A$. In Section 5 we prove that the constructed process X is the weak solution to (1.3), and that the martingale problem $(L, C^2_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d))$ is well-posed. In Section 6 we give the estimates on the time derivative $\partial_t p_t(x, y)$ and related auxiliary function appearing in the parametrix construction. In Section 7 we give the proofs of lower and upper bounds on $p_t(x, y)$. Appendices A and B contain some auxiliary results, used in the proofs.

2 The main results: preliminaries, formulation, and discussion

2.1 Notation and preliminaries

Through the paper we use the following notation.

By $g^{(\alpha)}(x)$ we denote the distribution density of the symmetric α-stable variable $Z_1^{(\alpha)}$. Note that $L^{(\alpha)}$ is a homogeneous operator of the order α and the process $Z^{(\alpha)}$ is self-similar: for any $c > 0$, the process

$$c^{-1/\alpha} Z_{ct}^{(\alpha)}, \quad t \geq 0$$

has the same law as $Z^{(\alpha)}$. Consequently, the transition probability density of $Z^{(\alpha)}$ equals $t^{-d/\alpha} g^{(\alpha)}(t^{-1/\alpha}(y-x))$. By $C_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ we denote the class of continuous functions vanishing at infinity; clearly, $C_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is a Banach space with respect to the sup-norm $\|\cdot\|_\infty$. By $C_\infty^k(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $k \geq 1$, (respectively, $C_b^k(\mathbb{R}^d)$) we denote the class of k-times continuously differentiable functions, vanishing at infinity (respectively, bounded) together with their derivatives.

We use the following notation for space and time-space convolutions of functions:

$$(f * g)_t(x,y) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f_t(x,z) g_t(z,y)\, dz,$$

$$(f \circledast g)_t(x,y) := \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f_{t-s}(x,z) g_s(z,y)\, dz ds.$$

As usual, $a \wedge b := \min(a,b)$, $a \vee b := \max(a,b)$. By $|\cdot|$ we denote both the modulus of a real number and the Euclidean norm of a vector. By c and C we denote positive constants, the value of which may vary from place to place. Relation $f \asymp g$ means that

$$cg \leq f \leq Cg.$$

By $\Gamma(\cdot), \mathrm{B}(\cdot,\cdot)$ we denote the Euler Gamma- and Beta-functions. Finally, we write $L_x f(x,y)$ to emphasize, that the operator L acts on the function $f(x,y)$ with respect to variable x.

Recall that a function $p_t(x,y)$ is said to be the *fundamental solution* to the Cauchy problem for the operator

$$\partial_t - L, \tag{2.1}$$

if for $t > 0$ it is differentiable in t, belongs to the domain of L as a function of x, and satisfies

$$\Big(\partial_t - L_x\Big) p_t(x,y) = 0, \quad t > 0, \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d, \tag{2.2}$$

$$p_t(x,\cdot) \to \delta_x, \quad t \to 0+, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d; \tag{2.3}$$

see [Ja02, Def. 2.7.12] in the case of a general pseudo-differential operator, which is the generalization of the corresponding definition (cf. [Fr64], for example) in the parabolic/elliptic setting.

In order to simplify the further exposition, we briefly outline the *parametrix method*, which we use to construct $p_t(x,y)$. Consider *some* approximation $p_t^0(x,y)$ to this function, and denote by $r_t(x,y)$ the residue term with respect to this approximation:

$$p_t(x,y) = p_t^0(x,y) + r_t(x,y). \tag{2.4}$$

Put

$$\Phi_t(x,y) := -\Big(\partial_t - L_x\Big)p^0_t(x,y), \quad t>0, \quad x,y\in\mathbb{R}^d. \tag{2.5}$$

Recall that $p_t(x,y)$ is supposed to be the fundamental solution for the operator (2.1), hence

$$\Big(\partial_t - L_x\Big)r_t(x,y) = \Phi_t(x,y).$$

Solving formally this equation in terms of the unknown fundamental solution $p_t(x,y)$ and then using (2.4), we get the following equation for $r_t(x,y)$:

$$r_t(x,y) = (p\circledast\Phi)_t(x,y) = (p^0\circledast\Phi)_t(x,y) + (r\circledast\Phi)_t(x,y).$$

The formal solution to this equation is given by the convolution

$$r_t(x,y) = (p^0\circledast\Psi)_t(x,y), \tag{2.6}$$

where Ψ is the sum of $\circledast$-convolutions of Φ:

$$\Psi_t(x,y) := \sum_{k\geq 1}\Phi_t^{\circledast k}(x,y). \tag{2.7}$$

If the series (2.7) converges and the convolution (2.6) is well defined, we obtain the required function $p_t(x,y)$ in the form

$$p_t(x,y) = p^0_t(x,y) + \sum_{k\geq 1}(p^0\circledast\Phi^{\circledast k})_t(x,y). \tag{2.8}$$

Clearly, the above argument is yet purely formal; to make it rigorous, we need to prove that the parametrix construction is feasible, i.e. that the sum in the r.h.s. of (2.8) is well defined, and then to associate $p_t(x,y)$ to the initial operator L. We note that the key point to make the entire approach successful is the proper choice of the zero order approximation $p^0_t(x,y)$; see Section 2.3 for more detailed discussion of this point.

2.2 The main results

Our standing assumption on the intensity coefficient $a(x)$ is that it is *strictly positive, bounded*, and *Hölder continuous* with some index $0<\eta\leq 1$, i.e. there exist $0<c<C$ such that

$$c\leq a(x)\leq C, \quad |a(x)-a(y)|\leq C|x-y|^\eta, \quad x,y\in\mathbb{R}^d. \tag{2.9}$$

We also assume that the drift coefficient $b(x)$ satisfies the assumption below:

$$b(\cdot)\in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d), \quad |b(x)-b(y)|\leq C|x-y|^\gamma, \quad x,y\in\mathbb{R}^d, \tag{2.10}$$

where $\gamma\in[0,1]$. Below we consider three cases; in each of them the Hölder index γ for the drift coefficient is related to the stability index α.

Case **A**. $\alpha\in(1,2)$, $\gamma=0$.
Case **B**. $\alpha\in((1+\gamma)^{-1},2)$, $0<\gamma<1$.
Case **C**. $\alpha\in(0,2)$, $\gamma=1$.

Remark 2.1. Observe that assumptions in the cases **A** – **C** overlap, but none of the assumptions is implied by the other one: if we denote by $\alpha_A, \alpha_B, \alpha_C$ the infima of α allowed in each of these cases, the we have $\alpha_A = 1$, $\alpha_B = (1+\gamma)^{-1}$, and $\alpha_C = 0$. Note that, while the drift coefficient becomes more regular in cases **A** – **C**, the parameters α_A – α_C become smaller. Heuristically, this means that increasing regularity of b we relax the assumption on α, and vice versa.

Note also that when we let $\gamma \to 1$ in the "intermediate case" **B**, we get $\alpha_B \to 1/2 \neq \alpha_C$, i.e. case **C** cannot be obtained from **B** by a simple limit procedure $\gamma \to 1$.

When b is Lipschitz continuous, the Cauchy problem for the ordinary differential equation (ODE)

$$dv_t = b(v_t)\,dt, \quad v_0 = x, \tag{2.11}$$

admits the *flow of solutions* $\{\chi_t, t \in \mathbb{R}\}$, cf. [CL55, Th. 2.1]. Denote by $\{\theta_t = \chi_t^{-1}, t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ the *inverse flow*, i.e. $\big(\theta_t \circ \chi_t\big)(x) = \big(\chi_t \circ \theta_t\big)(x) = x$, which can be also defined just as the flow of solutions to the Cauchy problem for the ODE

$$dv_t = -b(v_t)\,dt, \quad v_0 = x. \tag{2.12}$$

In all the results formulated in the sequel, we assume that (2.9), (2.10) hold true, and one of three assumptions which relate α and γ (cases **A** – **C**) is satisfied. In our first main result we specify in each of the cases **A** – **C**, the choice of the zero order approximation $p_t^0(x,y)$ in the parametrix construction outlined above, and prove that this construction is feasible.

Theorem 2.1. *Let*

$$p_t^0(x,y) := \frac{1}{t^{d/\alpha} a^{d/\alpha}(y)} g^{(\alpha)}\left(\frac{\omega(t,y)-x}{t^{1/\alpha} a^{1/\alpha}(y)}\right), \tag{2.13}$$

where

$$\omega(t,y) := \begin{cases} y, & \text{in case } \boldsymbol{A}; \\ y - tb(y), & \text{in case } \boldsymbol{B}; \\ \theta_t(y), & \text{in case } \boldsymbol{C}. \end{cases} \tag{2.14}$$

Then the following statements hold true.

1. *For $t > 0$, $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ the function $p_t(x,y)$ given by (2.8) is well defined, in the sense that the integrals $\Phi^{\circledast k}$ and $p^0 \circledast \Phi^{\circledast k}$ exist, and for every $T > 0$ the series involved in (2.8) converges absolutely on $(0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$.*

2. *The function $p_t(x,y)$ is continuous on $(0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$.*

3. *For any $\kappa \in (0, \alpha \wedge \eta)$ and $T > 0$, the following estimate for $r_t(x,y)$ (i.e. for the residue term in the representation (2.4)) holds true:*

$$|r_t(x,y)| \le C p_t^0(x,y) V_t\Big(\omega(t,y) - x\Big), \quad t \in (0,T],\ x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d, \tag{2.15}$$

where

$$V_t(z) = \begin{cases} t^{\kappa/\alpha} + t^{\delta}, & \text{if} \quad |z| \le t^{1/\alpha} \\ |z|^{\kappa} + t^{\delta}, & \text{if} \quad t^{1/\alpha} \le |z| \le 1, \\ 1 + t^{\delta}, & \text{if} \quad |z| \ge 1. \end{cases} \tag{2.16}$$

and

$$\delta := \begin{cases} \kappa, & \text{in cases } \boldsymbol{A} \text{ and } \boldsymbol{C}, \\ \big(1-\frac{1}{\alpha}+\gamma\big) \wedge \big(1-\frac{1}{\alpha}+\frac{\gamma}{\alpha}\big) \wedge \kappa, & \text{in case } \boldsymbol{B}. \end{cases}$$

Remark 2.2. We have

$$p_t^{(0)}(x,y) \asymp \frac{1}{t^{d/\alpha}} \frac{1}{(1+t^{-1/\alpha}|\omega(t,y)-x|)^{d+\alpha}} \tag{2.17}$$

(see (3.6) below). Hence (2.15) is equivalent to the following:

$$|r_t(x,y)| \le R_t\Big(\omega(t,y)-x\Big), \quad t \in (0,T],\, x,y \in \mathbb{R}^d, \tag{2.18}$$

where

$$R_t(z) = \begin{cases} ct^{-d/\alpha}(t^{\kappa/\alpha}+t^{\delta}), & \text{if} \quad |z| \le t^{1/\alpha}, \\ c\big(|z|^{\kappa}+t^{\delta}\big)\dfrac{t}{|z|^{d+\alpha}}, & \text{if} \quad t^{1/\alpha} < |z| \le 1, \\ \dfrac{ct}{|z|^{d+\alpha}}, & \text{if} \quad |z| > 1. \end{cases} \tag{2.19}$$

The proof of Theorem 2.1 and all the other theorems formulated below are postponed to subsequent sections. All the subsequent results use the same notation.

Next, we relate the function $p_t(x,y)$ to the initial operator L. To make the structure of the proofs most transparent, we do this in two steps. First, we prove that $p_t(x,y)$ is a transition probability density of *some* Markov process, and that the $C_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$-generator of the respective semigroup is an extension of $(L, C_\infty^2(\mathbb{R}^d))$.

Theorem 2.2. *Identity*

$$P_t f(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} p_t(x,y) f(y)\, dy, \quad f \in C_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \tag{2.20}$$

defines a strongly continuous conservative contraction semigroup of non-negative operators on $C_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, which in turn defines a (strong) Feller Markov process X. Every function $f \in C_\infty^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ belongs to the domain $D(A)$ of the generator A of this semigroup, and

$$Af(x) = Lf(x) = a(x)L^{(\alpha)}f(x) + \Big(b(x), \nabla f(x)\Big), \quad f \in C_\infty^2(\mathbb{R}^d);$$

that is, $(A, D(A))$ is an extension of $(L, C_\infty^2(\mathbb{R}^d))$.

Second, we prove that the semigroup (2.20) with $p_t(x,y)$ defined by (2.8) is in fact *unique* Feller semigroup associated with the operator (1.2). In addition, we show that the function $p_t(x,y)$, which was *formally* constructed under the assumption that it is a fundamental solution, indeed can be interpreted as a fundamental solution, but for the operator $\partial_t - A$ instead of the original one $\partial_t - L$.

Theorem 2.3. *The generator $(A, D(A))$ is the closure of $(L, C_\infty^2(\mathbb{R}^d))$ in $C_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$.*

The method we use to prove Theorem 2.3 also suites well for the proof of the following proposition, where we clarify the relation between the function $p_t(x,y)$ and the notion of the "fundamental solution", on which the parametrix construction of $p_t(x,y)$ was based. We formulate and prove this proposition under the additional assumption that in the case **C** the function $b(\cdot)$ is continuously differentiable (no additional assumptions in the cases **A**,**B** are required).

Proposition 2.1. *The function $p_t(x,y)$ is a fundamental solution to the Cauchy problem for the operator $\partial_t - A$; that is, for $t>0$ it is differentiable in t, belongs to the domain of A as a function of x, and satisfies (2.3) and the analogue of (2.2) with A_x instead of L_x.*

Next, we relate the process X constructed in Theorem 2.2 to the weak solution to the SDE driven by α-stable noise or, in a closely related terminology, to the solution of the martingale problem for $(L, C^2_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d))$. Namely, the semigroup $\{P_t\}$ corresponding to the process X possesses the Feller property, hence the process X has a cádlág modification, see [EK86, Chap. 4, Th. 2.7]. Denote by $\mathbb{P}_x$ the law of the Markov process X with $X_0 = x$ in the Skorokhod space $\mathbb{D}([0,\infty),\mathbb{R}^d)$ of cádlág functions $[0,\infty)\to\mathbb{R}^d$. Recall that a measure $\mathbb{P}$ on $\mathbb{D}([0,\infty),\mathbb{R}^d)$ is called a solution to the *martingale problem* for $(L, D(L))$, if for every $f\in D(L)$ the process

$$f(X_t) - \int_0^t Lf(X_s)\,ds, \quad t\ge 0$$

is a martingale with respect to $\mathbb{P}$, and the martingale problem $(L, D(L))$ is called *well posed*, if for every $x\in\mathbb{R}^d$ there exists unique solution to $(L, D(L))$ with $\mathbb{P}(X_0 = x) = 1$.

Theorem 2.4. *For any $x\in\mathbb{R}^d$ the SDE (1.3) with the initial condition $X_0 = x$ has a unique weak solution, and the law of this solution in $\mathbb{D}([0,\infty),\mathbb{R}^d)$ equals $\mathbb{P}_x$.*

In addition, the martingale problem $(L, D(L))$ is well posed, and $\mathbb{P}_x$ is its unique solution with the initial condition $X_0 = x$.

Remark 2.3. It is well known that, when both coefficients in equation of (1.3) are Lipschitz continuous, there exists a unique strong solution to (1.3) (see, for example, [IW81, Th. IV.9.1], or [GS82, Th. IV.3]). In our framework, the coefficient $a(x)$ is assumed to be only Hölder continuous. Up to our knowledge, there are no results on the existence and uniqueness of the strong solution under the assumption of Hölder continuity of coefficients in equations of type (1.3), see also [BBC04] for the negative example. See, however, [Pr14], [CSZ15], where under the assumption under the assumption that $a = 1$ and b is Hölder continuous the existence and uniqueness of the strong solution is shown.

The last two theorems contain explicit estimates, respectively, for $p_t(x,y)$ and for its derivative with respect to the time variable.

Theorem 2.5. *We have*

$$p_t(x,y) \asymp \frac{1}{t^{d/\alpha}} g^{(\alpha)}\left(\frac{\omega(t,y)-x}{t^{1/\alpha}}\right), \quad t\in(0,T],\ x,y\in\mathbb{R}^d. \tag{2.21}$$

Finally, in the theorem below we show the the continuity of the time derivative $\partial_t p_t(x,y)$, and provide the upper estimate for it. Note that these properties of $\partial_t p_t(x,y)$ are involved

in the proofs of Theorem 2.3 and Proposition 2.1; see assertions (4.21), (4.22) below. These properties also have an independent interest, e.g. in the context of estimation of the accuracy of discrete approximation of occupation time functionals; see [GK14].

Theorem 2.6. *1. There exists a set $\Upsilon \subset (0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^d$ of zero Lebesgue measure such that the function $p_t(x,y)$ defined by (2.4) – (2.7) has a derivative*

$$\partial_t p_t(x,y), \quad x\in\mathbb{R}^d, \quad (t,y)\notin\Upsilon,$$

*which for every fixed $(t,y)\notin\Upsilon$ is continuous in x. Moreover, in cases **A** and **B** the set Υ is empty, and $\partial_t p_t(x,y)$ is continuous in (t,x,y).*

2. The derivative $\partial_t p_t(x,y)$ possesses the bound

$$|\partial_t p_t(x,y)| \le C\Big(t^{-1}\vee t^{-1/\alpha}\Big)\frac{1}{t^{d/\alpha}}g^{(\alpha)}\left(\frac{\omega(t,y)-x}{t^{1/\alpha}}\right), \quad x\in\mathbb{R}^d, \quad (t,y)\notin\Upsilon.$$

3. For every $f\in C_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ the function

$$(0,\infty)\ni t\mapsto P_t f\in C_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$$

is continuously differentiable, and

$$(\partial_t P_t f)(x)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\partial_t p_t(x,y)f(y)dy.$$

Remark 2.4. For $\lambda>0$ denote

$$G^{(\lambda)}(x):=\big(|x|\vee 1\big)^{-d-\lambda}, \quad x\in\mathbb{R}^d. \tag{2.22}$$

Because $g^{(\alpha)}(x)\asymp G^{(\alpha)}(x)$ (see Proposition 3.2 below), one can replace in the above bounds $g^{(\alpha)}$ by $G^{(\alpha)}$, which would give then more explicit estimates. We have used $g^{(\alpha)}$ in order to emphasize the impact of the original α-stable process.

2.3 Overview and discussion

For the description and the background of the parametrix construction of the fundamental solution to a Cauchy problem for parabolic second order PDE's, we refer to the monograph of Friedman [Fr64]; see also the original papers by E.Levi [Le1907] and W. Feller [Fe36]. This construction was extended to equations with pseudo-differential operators in [Dr77], [ED81], [Ko89] and [Ko00], see also the reference list and an extensive overview in the monograph [EIK04]. In [Dr77], [ED81], and [Ko89] the "main term" in the pseudo-differential operator is assumed to have the form $a(x)L^{(\alpha)}$ (in our notation) with $\alpha>1$. In [Ko00] the stability index α is allowed to be ≤ 1, but in this case the gradient term is not involved in the equation. The list of subsequent and related publications is large, and we cannot discuss it here in details. Let us only mention two recent preprints: [CZ13], where two-sided estimates, more precise than those in [Ko89], are obtained, and [BK14], where the probabilistic interpretation of the parametrix construction and its application to the Monte-Carlo simulation is developed.

In all the references listed above it is required that either the stability index α is > 1, or the gradient term is not involved in the equation. This is the common assumption in all the references available for us in this direction, with the one important exception given by the recent paper [DF13], see also [FP10], [F13]. In [DF13], for a Lévy driven SDE with α-stable like noise, the question of *existence* of the distribution density is studied by a different method, based on the approximation of the initial SDE and discrete integration by parts. Such an approach is applicable for SDE's with the stability index of the noise $\alpha < 1$ and non-trivial drift, but it does not give proper tools neither for obtaining explicit estimates for this density, nor even for proving the existence and uniqueness of the solution to the initial SDE. Hence, the scope of our approach based on the parametrix construction, differs substantially from that of [DF13].

Our version of the parametrix construction contains a substantial novelty, which makes it possible to handle the case $\alpha \leq 1$ with non-trivial gradient term. To explain this modified construction in the most transparent form, we took the "jump component" in a relatively simple form $a(x)Z^{(\alpha)}$. Clearly, one can think about considering, for example, α-stable symbol with state dependent spectral measure, see [Ko00]. This, however, leads to additional cumbersome but inessential technicalities, and we prefer not do this in the current paper.

It was already mentioned that the parametrix construction described in Section 2.1 heavily relies on the choice of the "zero-order" approximation $p^0_t(x,y)$. In the case $\alpha > 1$, the first term $a(x)L^{(\alpha)}$ dominates the second term $b(x)\nabla$ in the sense that the symbol $a(x)|\xi|^\alpha$ of the first term grows as $|\xi| \to \infty$ faster than the modulus of the symbol $ib(x)\xi$ of the second term, see [Ja02] for detailed explanation. This allows to apply in the case $\alpha > 1$ the following "classical" method (cf. [Fr64], [Ko89]) to choose the zero-order approximation p^0: Consider the "principal part" $a(x)L^{(\alpha)}$ of the generator, "freeze" the coefficient $a(x)$ at some point $x = z$, then take the fundamental solution $q^z_t(x,y)$ to the operator $\partial_t - a(z)L^{(\alpha)}$ with this "frozen principal symbol", and finally put $p^0_t(x,y) := q^z_t(x,y)|_{z=y}$. However, this procedure is not successful in the case $\alpha \leq 1$, and the reason for this is already mentioned: in this case, the operator $a(x)L^{(\alpha)}$ no longer dominates the gradient term, and therefore it can not be treated as a "principal part" of L. One can modify the choice of the zero order approximation in several ways. One possible choice is to "freeze" the coefficients in the entire operator L (which is now itself considered as its "principal part"), and take the fundamental solution $q^z_t(x,y)$ to the Cauchy problem for $\partial_t - a(z)L^{(\alpha)} - (b(z),\nabla)$. This is exactly what we do in Case **B**. However, this procedure is limited by the relation between the parameter of the Hölder continuity γ and α. In Case **C** the choice of the zero order approximation is no longer related with the fundamental solution to an equation with frozen coefficients, but instead uses a carefully designed "corrector" $\omega(t,y)$, which makes it possible to treat all values $\alpha > 0$. The price of such an approach is the assumption of the Lipschiz continuity of the drift b.

The effect of the interplay between the value of α and the regularity properties required for b, which we have mentioned in Remark 2.1, was observed first in [Po94], [PP95]. It was shown therein that the parametrix construction is still feasible for (possibly unbounded) $b \in L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $p > d/(\alpha - 1)$, where $\alpha > 1$. In [BJ07] this effect was rediscovered in a stronger form: it is required therein that b belongs to the Kato class $\mathbb{K}_{d,\alpha-1}$. In [KS14] this result is extended even further, with b being allowed to be a generalized function equal to the derivative of a measure from $\mathbb{K}_{d,\alpha-1}$.

In general, there is a substantial gap between the problem of constructing a "candidate

for being the fundamental solution" (i.e., to prove that relations (2.4) – (2.7) make sense), and the problem of relating the constructed kernel $p_t(x,y)$ to a Markov process. The first way how one can possible solve this problem was proposed in [Ko89]. This way is the extension of the approach from [Fr64], where it is shown in the parabolic setting that $p_t(x,y)$ is twice continuously differentiable in x, and satisfies (2.2) in the classical sense. Note that the domain of the operator L is $C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. In the α-stable case the natural upper bound $\partial_{xx}^2 p_t^0(x,y) \le Ct^{-2/\alpha}$ is strongly singular for small t, and therefore it is difficult to prove using the parametrix construction that $p_t(\cdot,y) \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$; thus, one cannot check straightforwardly that the expression (2.2) makes sense. Instead, in [Ko89] the extended domain of $L^{(\alpha)}$ is introduced in terms of "hyper-singular integrals", and it is proved that $p_t(x,y)$ satisfies (2.2) in the corresponding "extended" sense. Once (2.2) is proved, the required properties of the Markov process associated with $p_t(x,y)$ follow from the positive maximum principle in a rather standard way. Another way to justify the parametrix construction, proposed in [Ko00], is to guarantee the required smoothness of $p_t(x,y)$ by using the integration by parts procedure, but this approach seems to be only partially relevant; see Remark 6.1 below.

Partially, one can solve the problem of relating the kernel $p_t(x,y)$ to a Markov process by using some approximation procedure (e.g. [Po94], [PP95]), or by analysing the perturbation of the resolvent kernels (cf. [BJ07]). However, the most difficult part here is to relate *uniquely* the initial symbol and the Markov process associated with $p_t(x,y)$. This problem was recently solved in [KS14], in the framework of a singular gradient perturbation of an α-stable generator, in terms of the weak solution to the corresponding SDE. See also [CW13], where alternatively the martingale problem approach was used. The technique therein is closely related to those introduced (in the diffusive setting) in [BC03], and apparently strongly relies on the structural assumption that the resolvent which corresponds to $p_t(x,y)$ is a perturbation of the resolvent of an α-stable process.

We propose a new method for solving this correspondence problem. This method is based on the notion of the *approximate fundamental solution* to the Cauchy problem for (2.1), see Section 4 and especially the discussion at the beginning of Section 4.2. Combined with a proper "approximate" version of the positive maximum principle, this notion gives a flexible tool both for proving the semigroup properties of $p_t(x,y)$ (Theorem 2.2), and for studying more delicate uniqueness issues (Theorem 2.3). We expect that this method will be well applicable in other situations, where the parametrix construction is feasible; this is the subject of our ongoing research.

Let us briefly discuss another large group of results, focused on the construction of a *semigroup* for a Markov process with a given symbol rather than of the transition probability density $p_t(x,y)$ for it. An approach based on properties of the symbol of the operator and on the Hilbert space methods, is developed in the works of Jacob [Ja94], see also the monograph [Ja96] for details. It allows to show the existence of the closed extension in $C_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ of a given pseudo-differential operator, and that this extension is the generator of a Feller semigroup. This approach was further developed by [Ho98a], [Ho98b], [B05], [Bo08], and relies on the symbolic calculus approach for the parametrix construction (cf. [Ku81], the original papers [Ts74], [Iw77]), and see also [Ja01]–[Ja05] for the detailed treatment).

Finally, we mention the group of results which are devoted to the well-posedness of the martingale problem for an integro-differential operator of certain type. For different types of perturbations of an α-stable generator this problem was treated in the works by [Ko84a],

[Ko84b], [Ts70], [Ts73], [MP92a]–[MP12a], [Ba88], see also [Ho94], [Ho95] for yet another approach for rather wide class of operators.

3 Proof of Theorem 2.1 and continuity properties of P_t

3.1 Function Φ: evaluation and an upper bound

Our first step in the proof of Theorem 2.1 is to evaluate the kernel Φ and to give an upper bound for it.

For $\lambda \in [0, \alpha)$ we introduce a family of kernels

$$Q_t^{(\lambda)}(x,y) := \left(\left| \frac{\omega(t,y)-x}{t^{1/\alpha}} \right|^{\lambda} \wedge t^{-\lambda/\alpha} \right) \frac{1}{t^{d/\alpha}} g^{(\alpha)} \left(\frac{\omega(t,y)-x}{t^{1/\alpha}} \right). \tag{3.1}$$

We remark that since $Q_t^{(\lambda)}(x,y)$ involves $\omega(t,y)$, we have in fact three different families $Q_t^{(\lambda)}(x,y), \lambda \in [0,\alpha)$, which correspond to the cases **A** – **C**.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\kappa \in (0, \alpha \wedge \eta), T > 0$. Then*

$$|\Phi_t(x,y)| \le C\Big(t^{-1+\kappa/\alpha} Q_t^{(\kappa)}(x,y) + t^{-1+\delta} Q_t^{(0)}(x,y) \Big), \quad t \in (0,T], \quad x,y \in \mathbb{R}^d, \tag{3.2}$$

*where $\delta = \kappa$ in cases **A** and **C**, and $\delta = (1 - 1/\alpha + \gamma) \wedge (1 - 1/\alpha + \gamma/\alpha) \wedge \kappa$ in case **B**.*

Before we proceed to the proof, we give some auxiliary statements. We postpone their proofs to the Appendix.

Proposition 3.1. *1. For any $\lambda > 0$, $c > 0$ there exists $C > 0$ such that*

$$G^{(\lambda)}(cx) \le C G^{(\lambda)}(x) \tag{3.3}$$

(see (2.22) for the definition of the functions $G^{(\lambda)}, \lambda > 0$).

2. For any $\lambda_1 > \lambda_2$ we have

$$G^{(\lambda_1)}(x) \le G^{(\lambda_2)}(x). \tag{3.4}$$

3. For any $\varepsilon \in (0, \lambda)$,

$$|x|^{\varepsilon} G^{(\lambda)}(x) \le C G^{(\lambda-\varepsilon)}(x). \tag{3.5}$$

Proposition 3.2. *For any $\alpha \in (0,2)$,*

$$g^{(\alpha)}(x) \asymp G^{(\alpha)}(x), \tag{3.6}$$

$$\left| (\nabla g^{(\alpha)})(x) \right| \le C G^{(\alpha+1)}(x), \tag{3.7}$$

$$\left| (L^{(\alpha)} g^{(\alpha)})(x) \right| \le C G^{(\alpha)}(x), \tag{3.8}$$

$$\left| (\nabla L^{(\alpha)} g^{(\alpha)})(x) \right| \le C G^{(\alpha+1)}(x), \tag{3.9}$$

$$\left| (\nabla^2 g^{(\alpha)})(x) \right| \le C G^{(\alpha+2)}(x). \tag{3.10}$$

Proof of Lemma 3.1. We consider cases **A** – **C** separately. To improve the readability, here and below we assume that $T > 0$ is fixed and, if it is not stated otherwise, in any formula containing t, x, or y we assume $t \in (0, T], x \in \mathbb{R}^d, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Case **A**. Fix $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and denote

$$L^z = a(z)L^{(\alpha)};$$

that is, consider "the principal part" of the operator L with the coefficient "frozen" at the point z (cf. the discussion in Section 2.3). Denote by $q_t^z(x, y)$ the transition probability density of the process $Z^{(\alpha)}$ with the time, re-scaled by $a(z)$:

$$q_t^z(x, y) = \frac{1}{t^{d/\alpha} a^{d/\alpha}(z)} g^{(\alpha)}\left(\frac{y - x}{t^{1/\alpha} a^{1/\alpha}(z)}\right).$$

Then $q_t^z(x, y)$ is a fundamental solution to the Cauchy problem for the operator $(\partial_t - L^z)$, and

$$p_t^0(x, y) = q_t^y(x, y).$$

Observe that the function $p_t^0(x, y)$ for any fixed $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ belongs to $C^1((0, \infty))$ as a function of t, and for any fixed $t \in (0, \infty)$, $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ belongs to $C_\infty^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ as a function of x. Since both ∇ and $L^{(\alpha)}$ are well defined on $C_\infty^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, the function $\Phi_t(x, y)$ is well defined by (2.5).

Since q^z is a fundamental solution for $\partial_t - L^z$, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi_t(x, y) &= \Big[-\Big(\partial_t - L_x^z\Big)p_t^0(x, y) + (L_x - L_x^z)p_t^0(x, y)\Big]\Big|_{z=y} = (L_x - L_x^z)p_t^0(x, y)\Big|_{z=y} \\
&= \Big(a(x) - a(y)\Big)L_x^{(\alpha)} p_t^0(x, y) + \Big(b(x), \nabla_x p_t^0(x, y)\Big) \\
&= \Big(a(x) - a(y)\Big)\frac{1}{t^{d/\alpha+1} a^{d/\alpha+1}(y)}(L^{(\alpha)} g^{(\alpha)})\left(\frac{y - x}{t^{1/\alpha} a^{1/\alpha}(y)}\right) \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{t^{(d+1)/\alpha} a^{(d+1)/\alpha}(y)}\left(b(x), (\nabla g^{(\alpha)})\left(\frac{y - x}{t^{1/\alpha} a^{1/\alpha}(y)}\right)\right) =: \Phi_t^1(x, y) + \Phi_t^2(x, y).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

First we estimate Φ^1. Since $a(x)$ is bounded and η-Hölder continuous, we have

$$|a(x) - a(y)| \le c\big(|x - y|^\eta \wedge 1\big) \le c\big(|x - y|^\kappa \wedge 1\big), \tag{3.12}$$

where we used that $\kappa < \alpha \wedge \eta$ (recall that by c and C we denote the generic constants, which may vary from place to place). Then by (3.8), (3.3) and (3.5) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
|\Phi_t^1(x, y)| &\le C\frac{|y - x|^\kappa \wedge 1}{t^{1+d/\alpha}} G^{(\alpha)}\left(\frac{y - x}{t^{1/\alpha}}\right) \\
&\le C t^{-1+\kappa/\alpha}\left|\frac{y - x}{t^{1/\alpha}}\right|^\kappa \frac{1}{t^{d/\alpha}} G^{(\alpha)}\left(\frac{y - x}{t^{1/\alpha}}\right) \\
&\le C t^{-1+\kappa/\alpha} Q_t^{(\kappa)}(x, y).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

To estimate Φ^2 recall that the functions $a(x)$ and $b(x)$ are bounded, and $a(x)$ is bounded away from zero. Hence by (3.7), (3.3) and (3.4) we have

$$|\Phi_t^2(x, y)| \le C t^{-(d+1)/\alpha} G^{(\alpha+1)}\left(\frac{y - x}{t^{1/\alpha}}\right) \le C t^{-1/\alpha} Q_t^{(0)}\left(\frac{y - x}{t^{1/\alpha}}\right). \tag{3.14}$$

Combining estimates (3.13) and (3.14), we obtain the required estimate.

Case **B**. We fix $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and define

$$L^z = a(z)L^{(\alpha)} + \Big(b(z), \nabla\Big);$$

that is, consider the entire operator L as its "principal part" and "freeze" its coefficients at the point z (cf. the discussion in Section 2.3 and the proof in case **A**). The fundamental solution $q_t^z(x,y)$ to the Cauchy problem for $(\partial_t - L^z)$ is equal to the transition probability density of the process $Z^{(\alpha)}$ with the time parameter rescaled by $a(z)$, and with the additional constant drift $tb(z)$:

$$q_t^z(x,y) = \frac{1}{t^{d/\alpha}a^{d/\alpha}(z)} g^{(\alpha)}\left(\frac{y-x-tb(z)}{t^{1/\alpha}a^{1/\alpha}(z)}\right). \tag{3.15}$$

Again, we have

$$p_t^0(x,y) = q_t^y(x,y).$$

Since q^ξ is the fundamental solution for $\partial_t - L^\xi$, we have in the same way as in (3.11)

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi_t(x,y) &= \Big[-\Big(\partial_t - L_x^z\Big)p_t^0(x,y) + (L_x - L_x^z)p_t^0(x,y)\Big]\Big|_{z=y} \\
&= \Big(a(x)-a(y)\Big)L_x^{(\alpha)}p_t^0(x,y) + \Big(b(x)-b(y), \nabla_x p_t^0(x,y)\Big) \\
&= \Big(a(x)-a(y)\Big)\frac{1}{t^{d/\alpha+1}a^{d/\alpha+1}(y)}(L^{(\alpha)}g^{(\alpha)})\left(\frac{y-tb(y)-x}{t^{1/\alpha}a^{1/\alpha}(y)}\right) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{t^{(d+1)/\alpha}a^{(d+1)/\alpha}(y)}\left(b(y)-b(x), (\nabla g^{(\alpha)})\left(\frac{y-tb(y)-x}{t^{1/\alpha}a^{1/\alpha}(y)}\right)\right) \\
&=: \Phi_t^1(x,y) + \Phi_t^2(x,y).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

Recall (3.12), and write

$$x - y = (y - tb(y) - x) + tb(y).$$

Then by the elementary inequality $|u+v|^\kappa \wedge 1 \le |u|^\kappa \wedge 1 + |v|^\kappa \wedge 1$ and the fact that $b(\cdot)$ is bounded, we obtain

$$|a(x)-a(y)| \le c\big(|y-tb(y)-x|^\kappa \wedge 1\big) + ct^\kappa. \tag{3.17}$$

Then using (3.8), (3.3) and (3.5) we derive

$$|\Phi_t^1(x,y)| \le Ct^{-1+\kappa/\alpha}Q_t^{(\kappa)}(x,y) + Ct^{-1+\kappa}Q_t^{(0)}(x,y). \tag{3.18}$$

Similar argument can be applied to $\Phi_t^2(x,y)$. Namely, using that $b(\cdot)$ is γ-Hölder continuous and bounded, we get

$$|b(x)-b(y)| \le c|y-tb(y)-x|^\gamma + ct^\gamma.$$

Then using (3.7) and (3.3)–(3.5) we derive

$$
\begin{aligned}
|\Phi^2_t(x,y)| &\le Ct^{-1/\alpha+\gamma/\alpha}\Big|\frac{y-tb(y)-x}{t^{1/\alpha}}\Big|^{\gamma}\frac{1}{t^{d/\alpha}}G^{(\alpha+1)}\left(\frac{y-tb(y)-x}{t^{1/\alpha}}\right)\\
&\quad + Ct^{-1/\alpha+\gamma}\frac{1}{t^{d/\alpha}}G^{(\alpha+1)}\left(\frac{y-tb(y)-x}{t^{1/\alpha}}\right)\\
&\le Ct^{-1/\alpha+\gamma/\alpha}\frac{1}{t^{d/\alpha}}G^{(\alpha+1-\gamma)}\left(\frac{y-tb(y)-x}{t^{1/\alpha}}\right)+Ct^{-1/\alpha+\gamma}\frac{1}{t^{d/\alpha}}G^{(\alpha+1)}\left(\frac{y-tb(y)-x}{t^{1/\alpha}}\right)\\
&\le Ct^{-1+\zeta}Q^{(0)}_t(x,y),
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.19}
$$

where $\zeta := (1-1/\alpha+\gamma)\wedge(1-1/\alpha+\gamma/\alpha)$. Thus, we arrive at (3.2).

Case **C**. In contrast with two previous cases, now we cannot interpret $p^0_t(x,y)$ as a fundamental solution to a Cauchy problem for some operator with "frozen" coefficients. Instead, we use the definition of the flow $\theta_t(y)$ and evaluate Φ directly.

Operators ∇ and $L^{(\alpha)}$ are homogeneous with respective orders 1 and α. From the identity

$$
(\partial_t - L^{(\alpha)})\big[t^{-d/\alpha}g^{(\alpha)}(t^{-1/\alpha}x)\big]=0,
$$

we derive

$$
\begin{aligned}
\partial_t p^0_t(x,y) = \Big[a(y)\frac{1}{a^{d/\alpha}(y)t^{d/\alpha}}(L^{(\alpha)}g^{(\alpha)})\left(\frac{w}{a(y)t^{1/\alpha}}\right)\\
+\Big(\partial_t\theta_t(y),\frac{1}{a^{d/\alpha+1}(y)t^{d/\alpha+1}}(\nabla g^{(\alpha)})\left(\frac{w}{a(y)t^{1/\alpha}}\right)\Big)\Big]\Big|_{w=\theta_t(y)-x}.
\end{aligned}
$$

On the other hand,

$$
\begin{aligned}
L_x p^0_t(x,y) = \Big[a(x)\frac{1}{a^{d/\alpha}(y)t^{d/\alpha}}(L^{(\alpha)}g^{(\alpha)})\left(\frac{w}{a(y)t^{1/\alpha}}\right)\\
-\Big(b(x),\frac{1}{a^{d/\alpha+1}(y)t^{d/\alpha+1}}(\nabla g^{(\alpha)})\left(\frac{w}{a(y)t^{1/\alpha}}\right)\Big)\Big]\Big|_{w=\theta_t(y)-x}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Because $\partial_t\theta_t(y) = -b(\theta_t(y))$, we finally get

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Phi_t(x,y) &= \big(L_x-\partial_t\big)p^0_t(x,y)\\
&= \Big(a(x)-a(y)\Big)\frac{1}{t^{d/\alpha+1}a^{d/\alpha+1}(y)}(L^{(\alpha)}g^{(\alpha)})\left(\frac{\theta_t(y)-x}{t^{1/\alpha}a^{1/\alpha}(y)}\right)\\
&\quad+\frac{1}{t^{(d+1)/\alpha}a^{(d+1)/\alpha}(y)}\left(b(\theta_t(y))-b(x),(\nabla g^{(\alpha)})\left(\frac{\theta_t(y)-x}{t^{1/\alpha}a^{1/\alpha}(y)}\right)\right)\\
&=: \Phi^1_t(x,y)+\Phi^2_t(x,y).
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.20}
$$

Since b is bounded, we have $|\theta_t(y)-y|\le ct$. Similarly to (3.17) we have

$$
|a(x)-a(y)| \le c(|\theta_t(y)-x|^{\kappa}\wedge 1)+ct^{\kappa}. \tag{3.21}
$$

Then using (3.8), (3.3) and (3.4), we get

$$|\Phi_t^1(x,y)| \le Ct^{-1+\kappa/\alpha}\Big|\frac{\theta_t(y)-x}{t^{1/\alpha}}\Big|^{\kappa}\frac{1}{t^{d/\alpha}}G^{(\alpha)}\left(\frac{\theta_t(y)-x}{t^{1/\alpha}}\right) + Ct^{-1+\kappa}\frac{1}{t^{d/\alpha}}G^{(\alpha)}\left(\frac{\theta_t(y)-x}{t^{1/\alpha}}\right)$$
$$\le Ct^{-1+\kappa/\alpha}Q_t^{(\kappa)}(x,y) + Ct^{-1+\kappa}Q_t^{(0)}(x,y).$$

For Φ^2 we have, since $b(x)$ is Lipschitz continuous,

$$|\Phi_t^2(x,y)| \le Ct^{-d/\alpha}\left|\frac{\theta_t(y)-x}{t^{1/\alpha}}\right|\left|(\nabla g^{(\alpha)})\left(\frac{\theta_t(y)-x}{t^{1/\alpha}a^{1/\alpha}(y)}\right)\right|.$$

Thus, using (3.7) and (3.3)–(3.5), we derive

$$|\Phi_t^2(x,y)| \le CQ_t^{(0)}(x,y).$$

Combining the above estimates, we arrive at (3.2).

□

3.2 Convergence of the parametric series and the estimate for the residue term

To estimate the convolution powers $\Phi_t^{\circledast k}(x,y)$, $k \ge 1$ inductively, we first slightly modify the upper bound for Φ obtained in Lemma 3.1. For $\lambda \in [0,\alpha)$, define

$$H_t^{(\lambda)}(x,y) := \left(\left(\left|\frac{\omega(t,y)-x}{t^{1/\alpha}}\right|^{\lambda} \vee 1\right) \wedge t^{-\lambda/\alpha}\right)\frac{1}{t^{d/\alpha}}g^{(\alpha)}\left(\frac{\omega(t,y)-x}{t^{1/\alpha}}\right). \tag{3.22}$$

Clearly,

$$Q_t^{(\lambda)}(x,y) \le H_t^{(\lambda)}(x,y),$$

and therefore a (weaker) analogue of (3.1) with $Q_t^{(\kappa)}(x,y)$, $Q_t^{(0)}(x,y)$ replaced by $H_t^{(\kappa)}(x,y)$, $H_t^{(0)}(x,y)$ holds true. The reason for us to modify (in fact, to weaken) the estimate (3.1) in that way is that this form is well designed for further inductive estimation of convolution powers of Φ; see a detailed discussion of this point in Remark 3.1 below. For possible further reference needs, we first develop this calculation in a general form, and then apply it for the particular function $\Phi_t(x,y)$ and kernels $H_t^{(\lambda)}(x,y)$.

Definition 3.1. A non-negative kernel $\{H_t(x,y), t>0, x,y\in\mathbb{R}^d\}$ has a sub-convolution property, if for every $T>0$ there exists a constant $C_{H,T}>0$ such that

$$(H_{t-s} * H_s)(x,y) \le C_{H,T}H_t(x,y), \quad t\in(0,T], \quad s\in(0,t), \quad x,y\in\mathbb{R}^d. \tag{3.23}$$

The kernel $\{H_t(x,y), t>0, x,y\in\mathbb{R}^d\}$ has a super-convolution property if the sign "$\le$" in (3.23) is changed to "$\ge$".

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose that the function $\Phi_t(x,y)$ satisfies*

$$\big|\Phi_t(x,y)\big| \le C_{\Phi,T}\Big(t^{-1+\delta_1}H_t^1(x,y) + t^{-1+\delta_2}H_t^2(x,y)\Big), \quad t\in(0,T],\, x,y\in\mathbb{R}^d, \tag{3.24}$$

with some δ_1, $\delta_2 \in (0,1)$ and some non-negative kernels $H_t^1(x,y), H_t^2(x,y)$. Assume also that the kernels $H_t^i(x,y)$, $i=1,2$, satisfy the sub-convolution property with constant $C_{H,T}$, and

$$H_t^1(x,y) \geq H_t^2(x,y). \tag{3.25}$$

Then for any $t \in (0,T]$, $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have

a)

$$\left|\Phi_t^{\circledast k}(x,y)\right| \leq \frac{C_1 C_2^k}{\Gamma(k\zeta)} t^{-1+(k-1)\zeta}\Big(t^{\delta_1} H_t^1(x,y) + t^{\delta_2} H_t^2(x,y)\Big), \quad k \geq 2, \tag{3.26}$$

where

$$C_1 = (3C_{H,T})^{-1}, \quad C_2 = 3C_{\Phi,T}C_{H,T}\Gamma(\zeta), \quad \text{and} \quad \zeta := \delta_1 \wedge \delta_2; \tag{3.27}$$

b) the series $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \Phi_t^{\circledast k}(x,y)$ is absolutely convergent and

$$\Big|\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \Phi_t^{\circledast k}(x,y)\Big| \leq C\Big(t^{-1+\delta_1} H_t^1(x,y) + t^{-1+\delta_2} H_t^2(x,y)\Big); \tag{3.28}$$

c)

$$\left|\Big(H^1 \circledast \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \Phi_t^{\circledast k}\Big)(x,y)\right| \leq C t^{\zeta} H_t^1(x,y). \tag{3.29}$$

Proof. Using the sub-convolution property of $H_t^i(x,y)$ and (3.25), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \big(H_{t-s}^1 * H_s^1\big)(x,y) &\leq C_{H,T} H_t^1(x,y), \\ \big(H_{t-s}^1 * H_s^2\big)(x,y) &\leq C_{H,T} H_t^1(x,y), \\ \big(H_{t-s}^2 * H_s^2\big)(x,y) &\leq C_{H,T} H_t^2(x,y), \end{aligned} \tag{3.30}$$

for every $t \leq T, s < t$.

First, we observe that (3.24) is exactly (3.26) with $k=1$. Next, we suppose that (3.26) holds for $k \geq 1$, and show that it also holds for $k+1$. Using (3.24), (3.26), (3.30), and the sub-convolution property for $H_t^1(x,y)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\Phi_t^{\circledast(k+1)}(x,y)| &= \left|\int_0^t (\Phi_{t-s}^{\circledast k} * \Phi_s)(x,y)\, ds\right| \\ &\leq \frac{C_1 C_2^k C_{\Phi,T}}{\Gamma(k\zeta)}\Big\{ \int_0^t (t-s)^{-1+(k-1)\zeta}(t-s)^{\delta_1} s^{-1+\delta_1} (H_{t-s}^1 * H_s^1)(x,y) ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t (t-s)^{-1+(k-1)\zeta}(t-s)^{\delta_1} s^{-1+\delta_2} (H_{t-s}^1 * H_s^2)(x,y) ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t (t-s)^{-1+(k-1)\zeta}(t-s)^{\delta_2} s^{-1+\delta_1} (H_{t-s}^2 * H_s^1)(x,y) ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t (t-s)^{-1+(k-1)\zeta}(t-s)^{\delta_2} s^{-1+\delta_2} (H_{t-s}^2 * H_s^2)(x,y)\, ds\Big\} \\ &\leq \frac{3C_{\Phi,T}C_1 C_2^k C_{H,T}}{\Gamma(k\zeta)} \mathrm{B}(k\zeta,\zeta) t^{-1+k\delta}\Big(t^{\delta_1} H_t^1(x,y) + t^{\delta_2} H_t^2(x,y)\Big) \\ &= \frac{C_1 C_2^{k+1}}{\Gamma((k+1)\zeta)} t^{-1+k\zeta}\Big(t^{\delta_1} H_t^1(x,y) + t^{\delta_2} H_t^2(x,y)\Big). \end{aligned} \tag{3.31}$$

By (3.26), the series $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\Phi_t^{(\circledast 2k)}(x,y)$ converge absolutely and

$$\Big|\sum_{k=2}^{\infty}\Phi_t^{\circledast k}(x,y)\Big| \le Ct^{-1+\zeta}\big(t^{\delta_1}H_t^1(x,y)+t^{\delta_2}H_t^2(x,y)\big), \tag{3.32}$$

which gives (3.28). Finally, (3.29) follows from (3.24), (3.28) and (3.30). □

Remark 3.1. Now we can explain why it is convenient to replace in (3.1) the kernels $Q_t^{(\kappa)}(x,y)$, $Q_t^{(0)}(x,y)$ by $H_t^{(\kappa)}(x,y)$, $H_t^{(0)}(x,y)$. If $\lambda>0$, the kernel $Q_t^{(\lambda)}(x,y)$ equals zero when $x=\omega(t,y)$, hence one can verify easily that $Q_t^{(\lambda)}(x,y)$ does not satisfy the sub-convolution property. On the contrary, for the kernels $H_t^{(\lambda)}(x,y), \lambda\ge 0$, the sub-convolution property holds true (see Proposition 3.3), and therefore by Lemma 3.2 the modified (3.1) can be easily extended to the bounds for the convolutions powers.

The quicker but less precise way of estimation $\Phi_t^{(\circledast k)}(x,y)$, $k\ge 1$ dates back to [Ko89], where under the assumption that $\alpha>1$ the kernels $Q_t^{(\kappa)}(x,y)$ were first bounded from above by $\frac{C}{t^{d/\alpha}}G^{(\alpha-\kappa)}\left(\frac{y-x}{t^{1/\alpha}}\right)$, and then the convolutions of the latter kernels were estimated. These modified kernels possess the sub-convolution property, but their "tails" are heavier than those of $Q_t^{(\kappa)}(x,y)$; hence such an estimate does not lead to a precise bound for the residue. In [CZ13], the (mixed) convolution powers of $Q_t^{(\kappa)}(x,y)$ and $Q_t^{(0)}(x,y)$ were estimated directly and precisely, although in a rather cumbersome way. Our way to estimate the convolution powers is motivated by both these approaches and inherits their advantages: by using the sub-convolution property we make the overall proof reasonably transparent, and because the "tails" of the auxiliary kernels $H_t^{(\kappa)}(x,y)$ are the same as for $Q_t^{(\kappa)}(x,y)$, our upper bounds on $\Phi_t^{(\circledast k)}(x,y)$ are as precise as those from [CZ13].

In the following proposition we collect the properties of the kernels $H_t^{(\lambda)}(x,y), \lambda\ge 0$ which we require to complete the proof of Theorem 2.1. We defer the proof of this proposition to Appendix B.

Proposition 3.3. *In each of the cases* ***A*** *–* ***C****, for every* $\lambda\in[0,\alpha), T>0$ *the kernel* $H_t^{(\lambda)}(x,y)$ *satisfies*

$$c\le\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}H_t^{(\lambda)}(x,y)dy\le C,\quad t\le T, \tag{3.33}$$

and possesses the sub- and super-convolution properties.

Proof of statements 1 and 3 of Theorem 2.1. We have

$$|\Phi_t(x,y)|\le C_{\Phi,T}\Big(t^{-1+\kappa/\alpha}H_t^{(\kappa)}(x,y)+t^{-1+\delta}H_t^{(0)}(x,y)\Big), \tag{3.34}$$

which is just (3.1) modified as we have explained above. Then we apply Lemma 3.2 with $\delta_1=\kappa/\alpha$, $\delta_2=\delta$, $H_t^1(x,y)=H_t^{(\kappa)}(x,y)$ and $H_t^2(x,y)=H_t^{(0)}(x,y)$, and get

$$\Big|\Phi_t^{\circledast k}(x,y)\Big|\le\frac{C_1C_2^k}{\Gamma(k\zeta)}t^{-1+(k-1)\zeta}\Big(t^{\kappa/\alpha}H_t^{(\kappa)}(x,y)+t^{\delta}H_t^{(0)}(x,y)\Big), \tag{3.35}$$

$$|\Psi_t(x,y)|\le C\Big(t^{-1+\kappa/\alpha}H_t^{(\kappa)}(x,y)+t^{-1+\delta}H_t^{(0)}(x,y)\Big), \tag{3.36}$$

where $\zeta = \delta \wedge (\kappa/\alpha)$. In addition, we have $p_t^0(x,y) \equiv H_t^{(0)}(x,y)$, and therefore by (3.29)

$$|r_t(x,y)| \le C\Big(t^{\kappa/\alpha} H_t^{(\kappa)}(x,y) + t^{\delta} H_t^{(0)}(x,y)\Big). \tag{3.37}$$

This completes the proof of statement 1. Because

$$H_t^{(\kappa)}(x,y) = \begin{cases} H_t^{(0)}(x,y), & |\omega(t,y)-x| \le t^{1/\alpha} \\ \frac{|\omega(t,y)-x|^{\kappa}}{t^{\kappa/\alpha}} H_t^{(0)}(x,y), & t^{1/\alpha} \le |\omega(t,y)-x| \le 1, \\ t^{-\kappa/\alpha} H_t^{(0)}(x,y), & |\omega(t,y)-x| \ge 1, \end{cases}$$

this also implies (2.15) and completes the proof of statement 3. □

The proof of statement 2 is postponed to the next subsection, where the continuity issues are treated in a unified way.

3.3 Continuity properties of $p_t(x,y)$ and P_t

Proof of statement 2 of Theorem 2.1. In each of the cases **A** – **C**, one can verify directly and easily that the function $p_t^0(x,y)$ and the corresponding $\Phi_t(x,y)$ are continuous in $(t,x,y) \in (0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d$. We show by induction the continuity of the functions $\Phi_t^{\circledast k}(x,y)$, $k \ge 2$.

Suppose that $\Phi_t^{\circledast(k-1)}(x,y)$ is continuous on $(0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d$. Denote

$$I_R(t,s,x,y) := \int_{B(0,R)} \Phi_{t-s}^{\circledast(k-1)}(x,z)\Phi_s(z,y)dz, \tag{3.38}$$

where $B(0,R)$ is the ball in $\mathbb{R}^d$ centered at 0 with radius R. By the induction assumption, the function under the integral is continuous in t,x,y for $0<s<t$.

Fix $R_0>0, \tau>0, T>\tau$, and $\varepsilon \in (0,\tau)$. Then the expression under the integral is uniformly continuous in t,x,y for $s\in[\varepsilon, t-\varepsilon], t\in[\tau,T], x\in B(0,R_0), y\in B(0,R_0)$, which by the dominated convergence theorem implies the continuity of $I_R(t,s,x,y)$ in the same domain if $R>R_0$.

Denote

$$I(t,s,x,y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Phi_{t-s}^{\circledast(k-1)}(x,z)\Phi_s(z,y)dz,$$

and observe that

$$|I(t,s,x,y) - I_R(t,s,x,y)| \le \int_{\mathbb{R}^d\setminus B(0,R)} |\Phi_{(t-s)}^{\circledast(k-1)}(x,z)\Phi_s(z,y)|dz \to 0, \quad R\to\infty, \tag{3.39}$$

uniformly in $s\in[\varepsilon,t-\varepsilon], t\in[\tau,T], x\in B(0,R_0), y\in B(0,R_0)$. Indeed, for R large enough and $z\in\mathbb{R}^d\setminus B(0,R)$, $y\in B(0,R_0)$, we have $|z-\omega(s,y)| \asymp |z|$, because the function $\omega(s,y)$ is bounded. This implies by (3.34)

$$|\Phi_s(z,y)| \le C(\varepsilon)|z|^{-d-\alpha+\kappa}$$

for $s\in[\varepsilon,t-\varepsilon]$, $t\in[\tau,T]$, $z\in\mathbb{R}^d\setminus B(0,R)$, $y\in B(0,R_0)$. Since for such s, t, x and z

$$|\Phi_{t-s}^{\circledast(k-1)}(x,y)| \le C(\varepsilon),$$

convergence (3.39) follows by the dominated convergence theorem. This gives that $I(t,s,x,y)$ is continuous in t,x,y.

Because

$$\Phi_t^{\circledast k}(x,y) = \int_0^t I(t,s,x,y)\,ds = \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0+}\int_\varepsilon^{t-\varepsilon} I(t,s,x,y)\,ds, \tag{3.40}$$

the same argument yields continuity of $\Phi_t^{\circledast k}(x,y)$. Namely, proceeding in the same way as in (3.31), we derive that for $t\in[\tau,T]$

$$\begin{aligned} |I(t,s,x,y)| &= \left|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Phi_{(t-s)}^{\circledast(k-1)}(x,z)\Phi_s(z,y)dz\right| \\ &\le c(t-s)^{-1+(k-1)\zeta}s^{-1+\zeta}\Big(H_t^{(\kappa)}(x,y)+H_t^{(0)}(x,y)\Big) \\ &\le C(t-s)^{-1+(k-1)\zeta}s^{-1+\zeta},\quad \zeta=\delta\wedge(\kappa/\alpha). \end{aligned} \tag{3.41}$$

Hence for every $\varepsilon>0$ the integral in the right hand side of (3.40) is continuous by the dominated convergence theorem. Convergence in (3.40) is uniform on compacts in $(0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d$; one can easily prove this using (3.41) and the expressions for $H^{(\kappa)}, H^{(0)}$. This completes the proof of continuity of $\Phi_t^{\circledast k}(x,y)$.

Since the series $\sum_{k=1}^\infty \Phi_t^{\circledast k}(x,y)$ converges uniformly on compact subsets of $(0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d$, the function $\Psi_t(x,y)$ is continuous, as well. Continuity of

$$r_t(x,y) = (p^0\circledast\Psi)_t(x,y) = p_t(x,y) - p_t^0(x,y)$$

follows by the same argument as the for $\Phi_t^{\circledast k}(x,y)$. □

In the rest of the section we derive the basic properties of the family of the operators P_t, $t>0$, defined by (2.20). This is used in the further analysis of the function $p_t(x,y)$ obtained via the parametrix construction.

Recall that $p_t^0(x,y)=H_t^{(0)}(x,y)$, hence by (3.37) and (3.33), for every $T>0$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} p_t(x,y)dy \le C,\quad t\in(0,T],\ x\in\mathbb{R}^d. \tag{3.42}$$

Then the family $P_tf(x), t>0$, is well defined by (2.20) for any bounded function f.

Lemma 3.3. *In each of the cases **A** – **C** of Theorem 2.1, the following properties hold true.*

1. *For any $t>0$, P_t is a bounded operator in $C_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$.*
2. *For every $f\in C_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ we have $\lim_{t\to0+}\|P_tf-f\|_\infty=0$.*

The proof relies on the following statement, the proof of which we defer to Appendix B.

Proposition 3.4. *In each of the cases **A** – **C**, for every $f\in C_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$*

$$\lim_{|x|\to\infty}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} p_t^0(x,y)f(y)dy = 0,\quad \textit{for any}\quad t>0, \tag{3.43}$$

$$\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^d}\left|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} p_t^0(x,y)f(y)dy - f(x)\right| \to 0,\quad t\to 0. \tag{3.44}$$

Proof of Lemma 3.3. 1. The proof of continuity of $P_t f$ is completely similar to the proof of the continuity of $p_t(x,y)$, and thus is omitted.

To prove that $P_t f(x)$ vanishes as $|x| \to \infty$, we use the representation for $p_t(x,y)$, estimate (2.15) on $r_t(x,y)$, and (3.43):

$$\Big| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} p_t(x,y) f(y) dy \Big| = \Big| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Big(p_t^0(x,y) + r_t(x,y) \Big) f(y) dy \Big| \\ \le C \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} p_t^0(x,y) |f(y)| dy \to 0, \quad |x| \to \infty.$$

Hence P_t maps $C_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ to $C_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Clearly, this operator is linear and bounded (its norm is bounded by the constant C from (3.42)).

2. By (3.37) and (3.33),

$$\sup_x \Big| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} r_t(x,y) f(y) dy \Big| \le C(t^{\kappa/\alpha} + t^\delta) \|f\|_\infty \to 0, \quad t \to 0. \tag{3.45}$$

Together with (3.44) this gives the required statement. □

4 Proofs of Theorem 2.2 and Theorem 2.3

If we would knew that the function $p_t(x,y)$, constructed in Theorem 2.1, is a fundamental solution to the Cauchy problem for $\partial_t - L$, then the properties of P_t stated in Theorem 2.2 could be obtained in a standard way based on the positive maximum principle, which holds true for the operator L, see [Ja01, Th.4.5.13]. We refer to [EK86, Ch.4] for the definition and the general results on the positive maximum principle. However, on this way we meet substantial difficulties already when we try to prove that L_x can be applied to $p_t(x,y)$. Recall that the domain of L is $C^2_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$. On the other hand, for the function $p_t^0(x,y)$ we have the following bounds, which can be derived from Proposition 3.2, but seemingly yet can not be improved:

$$|\nabla_x p_t^0(x,y)| \le C t^{-1/\alpha} H_t^{(0)}(x,y), \quad |\nabla^2_{xx} p_t^0(x,y)| \le C t^{-2/\alpha} H_t^{(0)}(x,y). \tag{4.1}$$

Hence the x-derivatives of $p_t^0(x,y)$ have non-integrable singularities in t near 0, and such a behaviour of $p_t^0(x,y)$ makes it unclear why $p_t(x,y)$ should belong to the domain of L_x.

This difficulty is rather typical. In what follows, we develop an approach which we believe to be well applicable in various situations similar to that one explained above. The keystone of this approach is that we use certain *approximate* solution to the Cauchy problem for $\partial_t - L$ instead of the exact one.

4.1 Approximate fundamental solution: construction and basic properties

For $\varepsilon > 0$ we introduce the auxiliary function

$$p_{t,\varepsilon}(x,y) := p^0_{t+\varepsilon}(x,y) + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} p^0_{t-s+\varepsilon}(x,z) \Psi_s(z,y) dz ds, \tag{4.2}$$

and define

$$P_{t,\varepsilon}f(x) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} p_{t,\varepsilon}(x,y)f(y)dy, \quad t>0,\, x\in\mathbb{R}^d, \quad f\in C_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d). \tag{4.3}$$

The additional time shift by positive ε removes the singularity at the point $s=t$, and this is the main reason why $p_{t,\varepsilon}(x,y)$ possesses the following properties:

(i) $p_{\cdot,\varepsilon}(x,y)\in C^1((0,\infty))$ for any fixed $\varepsilon>0$, $x,y\in\mathbb{R}^d$;

(ii) $p_{t,\varepsilon}(\cdot,y)\in C^2_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for any fixed $\varepsilon>0$, $t>0$, $y\in\mathbb{R}^d$;

(iii) for any $0<\tau<T$ we have $p_{t,\varepsilon}(x,y)\to p_t(x,y)$ as $\varepsilon\to 0$, uniformly in $(t,x)\in[\tau,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d$.

(iv) for any $0<\tau<T$ we have

$$q_{t,\varepsilon}(x,y) := \big(\partial_t - L_x\big)p_{t,\varepsilon}(x,y)\to 0, \quad \varepsilon\to 0,$$

uniformly in $(t,x,y)\in[\tau,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d$.

We do not give the detailed proof of these properties, because everywhere below (with the only exception of the proof of Proposition 2.1) we will need analogues of these properties for $P_{t,\varepsilon}f$, see Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 4.2; the proofs of (i) – (iv) above are completely analogous and omitted.

Properties (iii),(iv) motivate the name *approximate fundamental solution* we use for $p_{t,\varepsilon}(x,y)$: it approximates $p_t(x,y)$ and "satisfies" (2.2) in the approximate sense.

Lemma 4.1. *1. For every $f\in C_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $\varepsilon>0$ the function $P_{t,\varepsilon}f(x)$ belongs to $C^1((0,\infty))$ as a function of t and to $C^2_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ as a function of x.*

2. For every $f\in C_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $T>0$,

$$\|P_{t,\varepsilon}f - P_tf\|_\infty\to 0, \quad \varepsilon\to 0, \tag{4.4}$$

uniformly in $t\in[0,T]$, and for every $\varepsilon>0$

$$P_{t,\varepsilon}f(x)\to 0, \quad |x|\to\infty \tag{4.5}$$

uniformly in $t\in[0,T]$.

3. For $f\in C_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ we have

$$\lim_{t,\varepsilon\to 0+}\|P_{t,\varepsilon}f - f\|_\infty = 0.$$

In the proof of this lemma we use the following proposition.

Proposition 4.1. *1. There exists $\partial_t p^0_t(x,y)$, $t>0$, $x,y\in\mathbb{R}^d$, which is continuous on $(0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d$.*

2. The derivative $\partial_t p_t^0(x,y)$ possesses the upper bound

$$|\partial_t p_t^0(x,y)| \le C\Big(t^{-1} \vee t^{-1/\alpha}\Big) H_t^{(0)}(x,y), \quad t>0, \quad x,y \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

The proof of the first statement follows directly from the definition of $p_t^0(x,y)$. The second statement follows from the representation of $p_t^0(x,y)$ and Proposition 3.2.

Proof. Statement 1 can be easily derived by using the upper bound (3.36) on $\Psi_t(x,y)$, the upper estimates on $p_t^0(x,y)$, its space derivatives (4.1), time derivatives (see Proposition 4.1), and the dominated convergence theorem.

To prove statement 2, we first observe that the function

$$[0,T] \ni t \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} p_t^0(\cdot,y) f(y)\, dy \in C_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$$

is continuous: the continuity at the point $t=0$ is provided by Proposition 3.4, and the continuity at all the other points easily follows by the continuity of $p_t^0(x,y)$. Then

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} p_{t+\varepsilon}^0(x,y) f(y)\, dy \to \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} p_t^0(x,y) f(y)\, dy, \quad \varepsilon \to 0,$$

uniformly in $t \in [0,T], x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. This together with estimate (3.36) and the dominated convergence theorem, implies statement 2.

The proof of statement 3 is a slight variation of the proof of statement 2 in Lemma 3.3. Namely, by (3.44) we have

$$\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^d} \Big| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} p_{t+\varepsilon}^0(x,y) f(y) dy - f(x) \Big| \to 0, \quad t,\varepsilon \to 0.$$

Hence it is sufficient to show that

$$\sup_x \Big| \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Psi_{t-s+\varepsilon}(x,z) p_s^0(z,y) f(y) dy dz ds \Big| \to 0, \quad t,\varepsilon \to 0. \tag{4.6}$$

Using the bound 3.36, the identity $p_t^0(x,y) = H_t^{(0)}(x,y)$ and the properties $H_t^{(\kappa)}(x,y)$, $H_t^{(0)}(x,y)$, one can verify this relation similarly to (3.45). □

Denote

$$Q_{t,\varepsilon} f(x) = \big(\partial_t - L_x\big) P_{t,\varepsilon} f(x), \quad f \in C_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d). \tag{4.7}$$

Lemma 4.2. *For any $f \in C_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ we have*

1.

$$Q_{t,\varepsilon} f(x) \to 0, \quad \varepsilon \to 0, \tag{4.8}$$

uniformly in $(t,x) \in [\tau,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$ for any $\tau > 0$, $T > \tau$;

2.

$$\int_0^t Q_{s,\varepsilon} f(x) ds \to 0, \quad \varepsilon \to 0, \tag{4.9}$$

uniformly in $(t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$ for any $T > 0$.

Proof. We have

$$LP_{t,\varepsilon}f(x) = L_x \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} p^0_{t+\varepsilon}(x,y)f(y)dy + L_x \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} p^0_{t-s+\varepsilon}(x,z)\Psi_s(z,y)f(y)dydzds; \quad (4.10)$$

note that $P_{t,\varepsilon}f$ and both integrals in the right hand side are C^2_∞-functions in x (see Lemma 4.1 for the first term; the argument for the integral is the same). Hence the operator L_x in (4.10) is well applicable. We would like to interchange L_x with the integrals in (4.10), i.e. to write

$$LP_{t,\varepsilon}f(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} L_x p^0_{t+\varepsilon}(x,y)f(y)dy + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} L_x p^0_{t-s+\varepsilon}(x,z)\Psi_s(z,y)f(y)dydzds. \quad (4.11)$$

Recall that L is an integral-differential operator given by (1.2), and observe that the argument based on the dominated convergence theorem allows one to interchange the "differential part" $(b(x),\nabla)$ of this operator with the integrals in (4.10). To do the same with the "integral part" $a(x)L^{(\alpha)}$, recall that

$$L^{(\alpha)}f(x) = \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0+} L^{(\alpha,\varepsilon)}f(x), \quad L^{(\alpha,\varepsilon)}f(x) := \int_{|u|>\varepsilon} \Big(f(x+u)-f(x)\Big)\frac{c_\alpha}{|u|^{d+\alpha}}du,$$

and we interchange $a(x)L^{(\alpha,\varepsilon)}$ with the integrals just using the Fubini theorem. On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}|L^{(\alpha)}f(x) - L^{(\alpha,\varepsilon)}f(x)| &= \left|\int_{|u|\le\varepsilon} \Big(f(x+u)-f(x)-1_{|u|\le 1}(u,\nabla f)\Big)\frac{c_\alpha}{|u|^{d+\alpha}}du\right| \\ &\le C\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^d}|\nabla^2 f(x)| \int_{|u|\le\varepsilon}|u|^2\frac{c_\alpha}{|u|^{d+\alpha}}du.\end{aligned}$$

The integrals in (4.10) and the expressions under these integrals belong to $C^2_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ in x and their second derivatives admit explicit bounds, cf. (4.1) and Lemma 4.1. Hence if we put in the right hand side of (4.10) operators

$$(b(x),\nabla_x) + a(x)L^{(\alpha,\varepsilon)}_x,$$

instead of L_x, we get the expressions which tend to the original expressions as $\varepsilon\to 0$. The same is true for (4.11), and because we have already proved that we can interchange $(b(x),\nabla_x)+a(x)L^{(\alpha,\varepsilon)}_x$ with the integrals, we finally obtain (4.11).

Similarly, using the differentiability of $p^0_t(x,y)$ in t and the upper estimate on the respective derivatives (see Lemma 4.1 above), we derive

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t P_{t,\varepsilon}f(x) = &\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \partial_t p^0_{t+\varepsilon}(x,y)f(y)dy + \int_0^t\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \partial_t p^0_{t-s+\varepsilon}(x,z)\Psi_s(z,y)f(y)dydzds \\ &+ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} p^0_\varepsilon(x,z)\Psi_t(z,y)f(y)dydz.\end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

Since

$$(L_x-\partial_t)p^0_t(x,y) = \Phi_t(x,y),$$

combining (4.11) and (4.12) we derive

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{t,\varepsilon}f(x) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} p^0_\varepsilon(x,z)\Psi_t(z,y)f(y)dydz - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\Phi_{t+\varepsilon}(x,y)f(y)dy \\ &\quad - \int_0^t\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\Phi_{t-s+\varepsilon}(x,z)\Psi_s(z,y)f(y)dydzds. \end{aligned} \tag{4.13}$$

Since the function Ψ satisfies the equation

$$\Phi_t(x,y) = \Psi_t(x,y) - \int_0^t\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\Phi_{t-s}(x,z)\Psi_s(z,y)\,dzds,$$

we can rewrite $Q_{t,\varepsilon}f(x)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{t,\varepsilon}f(x) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} p^0_\varepsilon(x,z)\Psi_t(z,y)dz - \Psi_{t+\varepsilon}(x,y)\right)f(y)dy \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\left(\int_t^{t+\varepsilon}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\Phi_{t-s+\varepsilon}(x,z)\Psi_s(z,y)dzds\right)f(y)dy \\ &=: Q^1_{t,\varepsilon}f(x) + Q^2_{t,\varepsilon}f(x). \end{aligned}$$

By the uniform continuity of Ψ on compact subsets of $(0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d$ and estimate (3.36), we have

$$\sup_{t\in[\tau,T],x\in\mathbb{R}^d}\left|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\Psi_{t+\varepsilon}(x,y)f(y)\,dy - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\Psi_t(x,y)f(y)\,dy\right| \to 0, \quad \varepsilon\to 0.$$

Using again the uniform continuity of Ψ on compact subsets of $(0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d$, relation (3.44) and estimate (3.36), we obtain

$$\sup_{t\in[\tau,T],x\in\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d}\left|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} p^0_\varepsilon(x,z)\Psi_t(z,y)\,dz - \Psi_t(x,y)\right| \to 0, \quad \varepsilon\to 0,$$

$$\sup_{t\in[\tau,T],x\in\mathbb{R}^d}\left|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} p^0_\varepsilon(x,z)\Psi_t(z,y)f(y)\,dzdy - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\Psi_t(x,y)f(y)\,dy\right| \to 0, \quad \varepsilon\to 0.$$

This proves (4.8) with $Q^1_{t,\varepsilon}f(x)$ instead of $Q_{t,\varepsilon}f(x)$. By (3.36) we have

$$|Q^1_{t,\varepsilon}f(x)| \le Ct^{-1+\zeta}, \quad \zeta = \delta\wedge\kappa/\alpha,$$

hence (4.9) for $Q^1_{t,\varepsilon}f(x)$ easily follows from (4.8).

By (3.34), (3.36) and inequality $H^{(0)}\le H^{(\kappa)}$, we obtain in the same way as in (3.31)

$$\begin{aligned} \int_t^{t+\varepsilon}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|\Phi_{t-s+\varepsilon}(x,z)\Psi_s(z,y)|dzds &\le CH^{(\kappa)}_{t+\varepsilon}(x,y)\int_t^{t+\varepsilon}((t+\varepsilon-s)s)^{-1+\zeta}ds \\ &\le CH^{(\kappa)}_{t+\varepsilon}(x,y)t^{-1+\zeta}\int_t^{t+\varepsilon}(t+\varepsilon-s)^{-1+\zeta}ds \le C\varepsilon^\zeta t^{-1+\zeta}H^{(\kappa)}_{t+\varepsilon}(x,y). \end{aligned} \tag{4.14}$$

This immediately gives (4.8) and (4.9) with $Q^2_{t,\varepsilon}f(x)$ instead of $Q_{t,\varepsilon}f(x)$: we multiply (4.14) by $|f(y)|$ and integrate it either with respect to dy (for (4.8)), or with respect to $dyds$ (for (4.9)). □

4.2 Positive maximum principle, applied to the approximate fundamental solution. Proof of Theorem 2.2

The proof of Theorem 2.2 will follow from Lemmae 4.3 – 4.5 given below.

Lemma 4.3. *The operator P_t defined in* (2.20) *is positivity preserving, i.e. $P_t f \geq 0$ if $f \geq 0$.*

Proof. Take $f \in C_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $f \geq 0$, and suppose that

$$\inf_{t,x} P_t f(x) < 0. \tag{4.15}$$

Then there exists $T > 0$ such that

$$\inf_{t \leq T, x \in \mathbb{R}^d} P_t f(x) < 0.$$

Then by (4.4) there exist $\eta > 0, \theta > 0, \varepsilon_1 > 0$ such that

$$\inf_{t \leq T, x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \Big(P_{t,\varepsilon} f(x) + \theta t \Big) < -\eta, \quad \varepsilon < \varepsilon_1.$$

Denote

$$u_\varepsilon(t,x) = P_{t,\varepsilon} f(x) + \theta t,$$

and note that by (4.5)

$$u_\varepsilon(t,x) \to \theta t > 0, \quad |x| \to \infty$$

uniformly in $t \in [0,T]$. Hence the above infimum is in fact attained at some point; in what follows we fix one such a point for each ε, and denote it by $(t_\varepsilon, x_\varepsilon)$.

Since $f(x) \geq 0$, by statement 2 of Lemma 4.1 there exist $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, $\tau > 0$ such that

$$P_{t,\varepsilon} f(x) + \theta t \geq -\frac{\eta}{2}, \quad t \leq \tau, \quad \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Because

$$u_\varepsilon(t_\varepsilon, x_\varepsilon) = \min_{t \in [0,T], x \in \mathbb{R}^d} u_\varepsilon(t,x) < -\eta < -\frac{\eta}{2},$$

we have $t_\varepsilon > \tau$ as soon as $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$.

The operator L satisfies the positive maximum principle; that is, if whenever $f \in D(L)$, and $f(x_0) \geq 0$ where $x_0 = \arg\max f(x)$, then $Lf(x_0) \leq 0$, cf. [EK86, Ch. 4.2]. Therefore

$$L_x u_\varepsilon(t,x)|_{(t,x)=(t_\varepsilon,x_\varepsilon)} \geq 0.$$

In addition, for $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$

$$\partial_t u_\varepsilon(t,x)|_{(t,x)=(t_\varepsilon,x_\varepsilon)} \leq 0.$$

Note that inequality sign here may appear if $t_\varepsilon = T$, and because we have excluded another "boundary case" $t_\varepsilon = \tau$, the inverse inequality is impossible.

Then

$$(\partial_t - L_x) u_\varepsilon(t,x)|_{(t,x)=(t_\varepsilon,x_\varepsilon)} \leq 0. \tag{4.16}$$

On the other hand, because $t_\varepsilon \in [\tau, T]$, $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$ we have by the first statement of Lemma 4.2

$$(\partial_t - L_x) u_\varepsilon(t,x)|_{(t,x)=(t_\varepsilon,x_\varepsilon)} = \theta + Q_{t_\varepsilon,\varepsilon} f(x_\varepsilon) \to \theta > 0, \quad \varepsilon \to 0.$$

This gives contradiction and shows that (4.15) fails. □

Lemma 4.4. *The family of operators possesses the semigroup property: $P_{t+s} = P_s P_t$.*

Proof. The proof is based on the same argument as the proof of Lemma 4.3, hence we just sketch it. Take $f \in C_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and assume, for instance, that

$$P_{t+s}f(x) - P_t P_s f(x) < 0 \tag{4.17}$$

for some $s, t > 0, x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Fix this s, and observe that then for some $\eta > 0, \theta > 0, T > 0$ the function

$$u_\varepsilon(t,x) = P_{t+s,\varepsilon}f(x) - P_{t,\varepsilon}P_s f(x) + \theta t$$

satisfies

$$\inf_{t \le T, x \in \mathbb{R}^d} u_\varepsilon(t,x) < -\eta.$$

In addition, $u_\varepsilon(t,x) \to \theta t, |x| \to \infty$, hence the infimum is attained at some point $(t_\varepsilon, x_\varepsilon)$. Finally, $u_\varepsilon(t,x) \to 0$, $t, \varepsilon \to 0$ and therefore there exist $\tau > 0, \varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that $t_\varepsilon > \tau, \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$. Then, on one hand, (4.16) holds, and on the other hand

$$(\partial_t - L_x)u_\varepsilon(t,x)|_{(t,x)=(t_\varepsilon,x_\varepsilon)} = Q_{t_\varepsilon+s,\varepsilon}f(x_\varepsilon) - Q_{t_\varepsilon,\varepsilon}P_s f(x_\varepsilon) + \theta \to \theta > 0, \quad \varepsilon \to 0.$$

This gives the contradiction and proves that (4.17) is impossible. Changing f to $-f$, we see that the inverse inequality is impossible as well, which completes the proof. □

Lemma 4.5. *We have*

a)

$$P_t f(x) - f(x) = \int_0^t P_s L f(x)\, ds, \quad f \in C^2_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d); \tag{4.18}$$

b)

$$P_t 1 = 1.$$

Proof. We apply the same argument as in the above lemmas. Take $f \in C^2_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, and assume that

$$P_t f(x) < f(x) + \int_0^t P_s L f(x)\, ds. \tag{4.19}$$

Then repeating literally the above argument, we obtain the functions

$$u_\varepsilon(t,x) = P_{t,\varepsilon}f(x) - f(x) - \int_0^t P_{s,\varepsilon} L f(x)\, ds + \theta t, \quad \varepsilon > 0$$

and the points $(t_\varepsilon, x_\varepsilon)$, in which these functions attain their minima on $[0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$, such that for some $\tau > 0, \varepsilon_0 > 0$ we have $t_\varepsilon > \tau, \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$.

On one hand, for these functions we have (4.16). On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
(\partial_t - L_x)u_\varepsilon(t,x) &= Q_{t,\varepsilon}f(x) + Lf(x) - P_{t,\varepsilon}Lf(x) + \int_0^t L P_{s,\varepsilon} L f(x)\, ds + \theta \\
&= Q_{t,\varepsilon}f(x) + Lf(x) - P_{t,\varepsilon}Lf(x) + \int_0^t \Big(\partial_s P_{s,\varepsilon} L f(x) - Q_{s,\varepsilon} L f(x)\Big)\, ds + \theta \\
&= Q_{t,\varepsilon}f(x) - \int_0^t Q_{s,\varepsilon} L f(x)\, ds + \theta.
\end{aligned}$$

Then by Lemma 4.2

$$(\partial_t - L_x)u_\varepsilon(t,x)|_{(t,x)=(t_\varepsilon,x_\varepsilon)} \to \theta > 0, \quad \varepsilon \to 0,$$

which gives contradiction to (4.16) and disproves (4.19). Changing f to $-f$, we complete the proof of statement a).

To prove statement b), take $f \in C^2_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $f \equiv 1$ on the unit ball in $\mathbb{R}^d$, and put $f_k(x) = f(k^{-1}x)$. Then

$$f_k(x) \to 1, \quad Lf_k(x) \to 0, \quad k \to \infty,$$

and both $|f_k|$ and $|Lf_k|$ are bounded by some constant independent of k. Then using the equality $p^0_t(x,y) = H^{(0)}_t(x,y)$, the estimate (2.15) on the remainder $r_r(x,y)$, and Proposition 3.3, we can apply the dominated convergence theorem and pass to the limit in (4.18) as $k \to \infty$ in (4.18) with f_k instead f. This finishes the proof of statement b). □

Proof of Theorem 2.2. By Lemmas 4.3, 4.4 and the second statement of Lemma 4.5, the family of operators $\{P_t, t \geq 0\}$ forms a strongly continuous contraction semigroup, which is positivity preserving. Since the semigroup $\{P_t, t \geq 0\}$ possesses the continuous transition probability density $p_t(x,y)$, the respective Markov process X is strong Feller. Finally, the first statement of Lemma 4.5 implies that the restriction of the generator of $\{P_t, t \geq 0\}$ coincides with L on functions from $C^2_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

□

4.3 The generator of the semigroup $(P_t)_{t\geq 0}$: Proofs of Theorem 2.3 and Proposition 2.1

In Lemma 4.5 we proved that $(L, C^2_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d))$ is the restriction of $(A, D(A))$. Since A is a closed operator, this yields that $(L, C^2_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d))$ is closable. Let us show that its closure coincides with $(A, D(A))$.

Take $f \in C_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap D(A)$. Fix $t > 0$, and consider the functions $P_t f$ and $P_{t,\varepsilon} f$. Since $f \in D(A)$, then $P_t f \in D(A)$, and

$$AP_t f = \partial_t P_t f. \tag{4.20}$$

Recall that by statement 1 of Lemma 4.1 we have $P_{t,\varepsilon} f \in C^2_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and thus by Lemma 4.5 $P_{t,\varepsilon} f \in D(A)$. Hence

$$AP_{t,\varepsilon} f = LP_{t,\varepsilon} f = \partial_t P_{t,\varepsilon} f.$$

Observe that

- By statement 2 of Lemma 4.1, one has $P_{t,\varepsilon} f \to P_t f$ in $C_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$;
- By statement 1 of Lemma 4.2, one has $(\partial_t - L)P_{t,\varepsilon} f \to 0$ in $C_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$.

Assuming that we know

$$\partial_t P_{t,\varepsilon} \to \partial_t P_t f \quad \text{in } C_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0, \tag{4.21}$$

we derive

$$LP_{t,\varepsilon} f \to AP_t f \quad \text{in } C_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0,$$

which implies that $P_t f$ belongs to the domain of the $C_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$-closure of $(L, C^2_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d))$. Consequently, this closure coincides with $(A, D(A))$.

We have proved of Theorem 2.3 under the assumption (4.21). We verify this assumption in Lemma 6.4 below.

We also show in Lemma 6.4

$$\partial_t p_{t,\varepsilon}(x,y) \to \partial_t p_t(x,y), \quad \varepsilon \to 0, \tag{4.22}$$

uniformly on compact subsets of $(0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$. Using properties i), ii) and iv) of the function $p_{t,\varepsilon}(\cdot, y) \in C^2_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ (cf. Subsection 4.1), and applying to this function literally the same argument used in the case of $P_{t,\varepsilon} f(\cdot)$, we derive that $p_t(\cdot, y) \in D(A)$, and $p_t(x,y)$ is a fundamental solution to the Cauchy problem for $\partial_t - A$. □

5 Proof of Theorem 2.4

Using the Markov property of X, it is easy to deduce from (4.18) and the semigroup property for $p_t(x,y)$ the following: For given $f \in C^2_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $t_2 > t_1$, and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, for any $m \geq 1$, $r_1, \dots r_m \in [0, t_1]$, and bounded measurable $G : (\mathbb{R}^d)^m \to \mathbb{R}$ the identity

$$\mathbb{E}_x \left[f(X_{t_2}) - f(X_{t_2}) - \int_{t_1}^{t_2} h_f(X_s)\, ds \right] G(X_{r_1}, \dots, X_{r_m}) = 0$$

holds true. This means that for every $f \in C^2_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ the process

$$M^f_t = f(X_t) - \int_0^t h_f(X_s)\, ds, \quad t \geq 0 \tag{5.1}$$

is a $\mathbb{P}_x$-martingale for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$; that is, X is a solution to the martingale problem for $(L, C^2_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d))$.

Operator $(L, C^2_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d))$ is dissipative, which follows from the positive maximum principle, see [EK86, Lem. 4.2.1], or [Ja01, Lem. 4.5.2]). Next, its closure equals to the generator A of $C_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$-semigroup $\{P_t, t \geq 0\}$, hence for every $\lambda > 0$ the range of the resolvent $(\lambda - L)^{-1}$ in $C_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is dense. Hence the required uniqueness of the solution to the martingale problem $(L, C^2_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d))$ follows by [EK86, Thm. 4.4.1].

It follows straightforwardly from the Itô formula, that any weak solution to (1.3) is a solution to the martingale problem for $(L, C^2_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d))$. Since we have already proved that this martingale problem is well posed, this immediately proves the *uniqueness* of the weak solution to (1.3). The proof of the *existence* of a weak solution can be conducted in a standard way, which we outline below.

- Consider the family of equations

$$dX^{(n)}_t = b_n(X^{(n)}_t)dt + \sigma_n(X^{(n)}_{t-})dZ^{(\alpha)}_t. \tag{5.2}$$

  with smooth coefficients b_n and σ_n, approximating the coefficients b and σ of (1.3). We can choose the approximations b_n and σ_n such that the functions $a_n = (\sigma_n)^\alpha, n \geq 1$ and $b_n, n \geq 1$ the constants satisfy (2.9) and (2.10) with the same constants. Since

the coefficients in (5.2) are smooth, there exists a (strong) solution $X_t^{(n)}$ to (5.2). This solution is a strong Markov process, admitting the transition probability density $p_t^{(n)}(x,y)$. Note that under our assumption on the coefficients the upper bound for the residue term in Theorem 2.1 can be achieved uniformly in n, and consequently

$$p_t^{(n)}(x,y) \le \frac{C}{t^{d/\alpha}} g^{(\alpha)}\left(\frac{\omega_n(t,y)-x}{t^{1/\alpha}}\right), \quad t \in (0,T], \quad x,y \in \mathbb{R}^d, \tag{5.3}$$

where the constant $C > 0$ is independent of n, and $\omega_n(t,y)$ is given by (2.14) with b replaced by b_n, and the flow θ_t replaced by the corresponding flow.

- We show that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[|(X_{t+s}^{(n)}, Z_{t+s}^{(\alpha)}) - (X_t^{(n)}, Z_t^{(\alpha)})|^\beta | \mathcal{F}_t\right] \le \rho(s), \tag{5.4}$$

where $\mathcal{F}_t := \sigma\{Z_s^{(\alpha)},\, s \le t\}$, the non-random function $\rho(s)$ tends to 0 as $s \to 0$, and $\beta \in (0,\alpha)$ is some constant. This would imply by Theorem 8.6 and Remark 8.7 from [EK86, Ch. 3] that the sequence $(X^{(n)}, Z^{(\alpha)})$ is weakly compact in $\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}^+, (\mathbb{R}^d)^2)$.

Using the inequality $(u+v)^\beta \le 2^{\beta-1}(u^\beta + v^\beta)$ for positive u, v and β, and the Markov property of $(X_t^{(n)}, Z_t^{(\alpha)})$ we derive

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_x\left[|(X_{t+s}^{(n)}, Z_{t+s}^{(\alpha)}) - (X_t^{(n)}, Z_t^{(\alpha)})|^\beta | \mathcal{F}_t\right] \\
&\quad = \mathbb{E}_{(X_t^{(n)}, Z_t^{(\alpha)})}\left[\left|(X_s^{(n)}, Z_s^{(\alpha)}) - (X_0^{(n)}, Z_0^{(\alpha)})\right|^\beta\right] \\
&\quad = \mathbb{E}_{(X_t^{(n)}, Z_t^{(\alpha)})}\left[\left(|X_s^{(n)} - X_0^{(n)}|^2 + |Z_s^{(\alpha)} - Z_0^{(\alpha)})|^2\right)^{\beta/2}\right] \\
&\quad \le 2^{\beta/2-1}\left(\mathbb{E}_{X_t^{(n)}}\left[|X_s^{(n)} - X_0^{(n)}|^\beta\right] + \mathbb{E}_{Z_t^{(\alpha)}}\left[|Z_s^{(\alpha)} - Z_0^{(\alpha)}|^\beta\right]\right) \\
&\quad \le C \sup_x \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |y-x|^\beta \frac{1}{s^{d/\alpha}} g^{(\alpha)}\left(\frac{\omega_n(s,y)-x}{s^{1/\alpha}}\right) dy + C\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |z|^\beta \frac{1}{s^{d/\alpha}} g^{(\alpha)}\left(\frac{z}{s^{1/\alpha}}\right) dz.
\end{aligned}$$

We have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |z|^\beta \frac{1}{s^{d/\alpha}} g^{(\alpha)}\left(\frac{z}{s^{1/\alpha}}\right) dz = c s^{\beta/\alpha}.$$

On the other hand, we can decompose $y - x = (\omega_n(s,y) - x) - (\omega_n(s,y) - y)$, and $|\omega_n(s,y) - y| \le Cs$ because the sequence $b_n(\cdot), n \ge 1$ is uniformly bounded. Now simple calculation finally gives (5.4) with $\rho(s) = C(s^{\beta/\alpha} + s^\beta)$.

- By the weak compactness of the sequence $(X^{(n)}, Z^{(\alpha)})$, there exists a weak limit $(\tilde{X}, \tilde{Z}^{(\alpha)})$ of $(X^{(n)}, Z^{(\alpha)})$. By [KP91, Thm. 2.2, Rem. 2.5], this weak limit is a weak solution to (1.3).

□

6 Time derivative of $p_t(x,y)$. Proof of Theorem 2.6

6.1 Outline

Our goal in this section is to prove the existence of the time derivative $\partial_t p_t(x,y)$, and to give estimates for this derivative. We begin with the outline of our approach, and indicate the main difficulties.

We would like to extend the properties of $p^0_t(x,y)$ stated in Proposition 4.1 to similar properties of $p_t(x,y)$. We have the integral representation

$$p_t(x,y) = p^0_t(x,y) + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} p^0_{t-s}(x,z)\Psi_s(z,y)\,dzds,$$

which is just the another form of (2.8); cf. (2.7). However, for the required extension one cannot use this representation straightforwardly, because the upper bound for $|\partial_t p^0_{t-s}(x,z)|$ has a non-integrable singularity $(t-s)^{-1} \vee (t-s)^{-1/\alpha}$ at the point $s=t$. Therefore we rewrite the integral representation for $p_t(x,y)$ in the following way:

$$p_t(x,y) = p^0_t(x,y) + \int_0^{t/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} p^0_{t-s}(x,z)\Psi_s(z,y)\,dzds + \int_0^{t/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} p^0_s(x,z)\Psi_{t-s}(z,y)\,dz\,ds. \tag{6.1}$$

Using this representation, we avoid the annoying singularities related to $p^0_t(x,y)$, but instead we have to establish the differential properties of Ψ with respect to the time variable. For this we proceed in the way similar to that used in Section 3.2: first we establish the required properties for Φ, then for its convolutions, and finally for Ψ. The minor difficulty which arises is that in case **C** the function $b(x)$ is not supposed to be from the class $C^1_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$, and therefore $\Phi_t(x,y)$ is not continuously differentiable in t. This difficulty is of completely technical nature, and is resolved by choosing a suitable formulation for differentiability property of $\Phi_t(x,y)$ and its convolutions.

6.2 Time derivatives of Φ, $\Phi^{\circledast k}$ and Ψ. Proof of the convergence in (4.21) and (4.22).

Consider first the following "smooth" case.

Lemma 6.1. *Assume that either one of cases **A** or **B** of Theorem 2.1 holds true, or case **C** of Theorem 2.1 holds true with an additional assumption $b \in C^1_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then the statements below hold true.*

1. *Function $\Phi_t(x,y)$ defined by (2.5) possesses the derivative $\partial_t\Phi_t(x,y)$, which is continuous on $(0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d$.*
2. *For any $\kappa \in (0, \eta\wedge\alpha)$ and $T>0$, the derivative $\partial_t\Phi_t(x,y)$ possesses the bound*

$$|\partial_t\Phi_t(x,y)| \le C\Big(t^{-1}\vee t^{-1/\alpha}\Big)\Big(t^{-1+\kappa/\alpha}H^{(\kappa)}_t + t^{-1+\delta}H^{(0)}_t(x,y)\Big), \quad t\in(0,T], \quad x,y\in\mathbb{R}^d. \tag{6.2}$$

Proof. We give the calculations for the case **C** only; the other cases are similar and simpler. Statement 1 follows directly from the explicit formula (3.20). To prove statement 2 we estimate separately the derivatives of $\Phi^1_t(x,y)$, $\Phi^2_t(x,y)$ in (3.20). We have

$$\begin{aligned}|\partial_t\Phi^1_t(x,y)| \le C\Big|a(x)-a(y)\Big|\Big\{&\frac{1}{t^{d/\alpha+2}}\Big|(L^{(\alpha)}g^{(\alpha)})\left(\frac{\theta_t(y)-x}{t^{1/\alpha}a^{1/\alpha}(y)}\right)\Big|\\ &+\frac{1}{t^{d/\alpha+1+1/\alpha}}\Big|(\nabla L^{(\alpha)}g^{(\alpha)})\left(\frac{\theta_t(y)-x}{t^{1/\alpha}a^{1/\alpha}(y)}\right)\Big|\\ &+\frac{1}{t^{d/\alpha+2}}\Big|(\nabla L^{(\alpha)}g^{(\alpha)})\left(\frac{\theta_t(y)-x}{t^{1/\alpha}a^{1/\alpha}(y)}\right)\Big|\,\Big|\frac{\theta_t(y)-x}{t^{1/\alpha}}\Big|\Big\},\end{aligned}$$

because $\partial_t\theta_t(y) = -b(\theta_t(y))$, which is bounded. Applying (3.21) with $\kappa \in (0, \eta\wedge\alpha)$, we get by (3.8), (3.9), and (3.3)–(3.5) the estimates

$$\begin{aligned}|\partial_t\Phi^1_t(x,y)| &\le C\Big|a(y)-a(x)\Big|\Big(\frac{1}{t^{d/\alpha+2}}+\frac{1}{t^{d/\alpha+1+1/\alpha}}\Big)g^{(\alpha)}\left(\frac{\theta_t(y)-x}{t^{1/\alpha}a^{1/\alpha}(y)}\right)\\ &\le C\Big(t^{-2}+t^{-1-1/\alpha}\Big)\Big(t^{\kappa/\alpha}H^{(\kappa)}_t(x,y)+t^{\kappa}H^{(0)}_t(x,y)\Big)\\ &\le C(t^{-1}\vee t^{-1/\alpha})\Big(t^{-1+\kappa/\alpha}H^{(\kappa)}_t(x,y)+t^{-1+\kappa}H^{(0)}_t(x,y)\Big).\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}|\partial_t\Phi^2_t(x,y)| \le{}& Ct^{-d/\alpha-1/\alpha}\Big|(\nabla g^{(\alpha)})\left(\frac{\theta_t(y)-x}{t^{1/\alpha}a^{1/\alpha}(y)}\right)\Big|\\ &+Ct^{-d/\alpha-1/\alpha-1}\Big|b(\theta_t(y))-b(x)\Big|\Big|(\nabla g^{(\alpha)})\left(\frac{\theta_t(y)-x}{t^{1/\alpha}a^{1/\alpha}(y)}\right)\Big|\\ &+Ct^{-d/\alpha-1/\alpha-1}\Big|b(\theta_t(y))-b(x)\Big|\Big|(\nabla^2 g^{(\alpha)})\left(\frac{\theta_t(y)-x}{t^{1/\alpha}a^{1/\alpha}(y)}\right)\Big|\,\Big|\frac{\theta_t(y)-x}{t^{1/\alpha}}\Big|\\ &+Ct^{-d/\alpha-2/\alpha}\Big|b(\theta_t(y))-b(x)\Big|\Big|(\nabla^2 g^{(\alpha)})\left(\frac{\theta_t(y)-x}{t^{1/\alpha}a^{1/\alpha}(y)}\right)\Big|,\end{aligned}$$

where we have used that ∇b and $\partial_t\theta_t(y)$ are bounded. Therefore, using the Lipschitz condition for b and (3.7), (3.10), we can write a shorter (and less precise) estimate

$$|\partial_t\Phi^2_t(x,y)| \le C(t^{-1}\vee t^{-1/\alpha})H^{(0)}_t(x,y), \quad t\in(0,T],\, x,y\in\mathbb{R}^d,$$

which combined with the estimate for $\Phi^1_t(x,y)$ completes the proof. □

Lemma 6.2. *Under the condition of Lemma 6.1, the following statements hold true.*

1. *The functions $\Phi^{\circledast k}_t(x,y)$ and $\Psi_t(x,y)$, defined by (2.5) have derivatives*

$$\partial_t\Phi^{\circledast k}_t(x,y), \quad \partial_t\Psi_t(x,y), \quad t>0, \quad x,y\in\mathbb{R}^d,$$

continuous on $(0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d$.

2. For any $\kappa \in (0, \eta \wedge \alpha)$ and $T > 0$ there exist constants C_3, C_4 and C_5 such that

$$|\partial_t \Phi_t^{\circledast k}(x,y)| \le \frac{C_3 C_4^k}{\Gamma(k\zeta)} \Big(t^{-1} \vee t^{-1/\alpha}\Big) t^{-1+(k-1)\zeta} \Big(t^{\kappa/\alpha} H_t^{(\kappa)}(x,y) + t^{\delta} H_t^{(0)}(x,y)\Big), \quad (6.3)$$

$$|\partial_t \Psi_t(x,y)| \le C_5 \Big(t^{-1} \vee t^{-1/\alpha}\Big) \Big(t^{\kappa/\alpha} H_t^{(\kappa)}(x,y) + t^{\delta} H_t^{(0)}(x,y)\Big), \quad (6.4)$$

for all $t \in (0,T]$, $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Proof. Since the proof is similar to that of Lemma 3.2, we only sketch the argument. Let C_1, C_2 be that same as in (3.35) (see also (3.27)). We show that (6.3) holds true with $C_3 = C \vee \big(3C_1/\Gamma(\zeta)\big)$ and $C_4 = C_2(2 \vee 2^{1/\alpha})$, where the constant $C > 0$ is the that one from from (6.2).

Split

$$\Phi_t^{\circledast(k+1)}(x,y) = \int_0^{t/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Phi_{t-s}^{\circledast k}(x,z) \Phi_s(z,y)\, dzds + \int_0^{t/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Phi_s^{\circledast k}(x,z) \Phi_{t-s}(z,y)\, dzds. \quad (6.5)$$

By induction, it can be easily shown that each $\Phi_t^{\circledast k}(x,y)$ is continuously differentiable in t, and

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \Phi_t^{\circledast(k+1)}(x,y) = &\int_0^{t/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\partial_t \Phi^{\circledast k})_{t-s}(x,z) \Phi_s(z,y)\, dzds + \int_0^{t/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Phi_s^{\circledast k}(x,z) (\partial_t \Phi)_{t-s}(z,y)\, dzds \\ &+ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Phi_{t/2}^{\circledast k}(x,z) \Phi_{t/2}(z,y)\, dz. \end{aligned} \quad (6.6)$$

Observe that

$$(t-s)^{-1} \vee (t-s)^{-1/\alpha} \le \big(2 \vee 2^{1/\alpha}\big)\Big(t^{-1} \vee t^{-1/\alpha}\Big), \quad s \in (0, t/2).$$

Using this inequality and pulling out from the integrals the term $\big(2 \vee 2^{1/\alpha}\big)\big(t^{-1} \vee t^{-1/\alpha}\big)$, we get by the induction assumption

$$\begin{aligned} \Big| \int_0^{t/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\partial_t \Phi^{\circledast k})_{t-s}(x,z) \Phi_s(z,y)\, dzds \Big| &\le \frac{C_3 C_4^k C_{\Phi,T}(2 \vee 2^{1/\alpha})}{\Gamma(\zeta k)} (t^{-1} \vee t^{-1/\alpha}) \\ &\times \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (t-s)^{-1+(k-1)\zeta} \Big((t-s)^{\kappa/\alpha} H_{t-s}^{(\kappa)}(x,z) + (t-s)^{\delta} H_{t-s}^{(0)}(x,z)\Big) \\ &\times \Big(s^{\kappa/\alpha} H_s^{(\kappa)}(z,y) + s^{\delta} H_s^{(0)}(z,y)\Big) dzds \\ &\le \frac{C_3 C_4^k 3 C_{\Phi,T} C_{H,T}(2 \vee 2^{1/\alpha})}{\Gamma(\zeta k)} (t^{-1} \vee t^{-1/\alpha}) \mathrm{B}(\zeta k, \zeta) t^{-1+k\zeta} \Big(t^{\kappa/\alpha} H_t^{(\kappa)}(x,y) + t^{\delta} H_t^{(0)}(x,y)\Big) \\ &= \frac{C_3 C_4^k 3 C_{\Phi,T} C_{H,T}(2 \vee 2^{1/\alpha}) \Gamma(\zeta)}{\Gamma(\zeta(k+1))} (t^{-1} \vee t^{-1/\alpha}) t^{-1+k\zeta} \Big(t^{\kappa/\alpha} H_t^{(\kappa)}(x,y) + t^{\delta} H_t^{(0)}(x,y)\Big) \\ &\le \frac{C_3 C_4^{k+1}}{3\Gamma(\zeta(k+1))} (t^{-1} \vee t^{-1/\alpha}) t^{-1+k\zeta} \Big(t^{\kappa/\alpha} H_t^{(\kappa)}(x,y) + t^{\delta} H_t^{(0)}(x,y)\Big). \end{aligned}$$

In the same fashion, it can be shown that

$$\Big| \int_0^{t/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Phi_s^{\circledast k}(x,z)(\partial_t \Phi)_{t-s}(z,y)\, dzds \Big| \\ \leq \frac{C_3 C_4^{k+1}}{3\Gamma((k+1)\zeta)} (t^{-1} \vee t^{-1/\alpha}) t^{-1+k\zeta} \Big(t^{\kappa/\alpha} H_t^{(\kappa)}(x,y) + t^{\delta} H_t^{(0)}(x,y) \Big).$$

For the third term we have by (3.35)

$$\Big| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Phi_{t/2}^{\circledast k}(x,z) \Phi_{t/2}(z,y)\, dz \Big| \leq \frac{C_1 C_2^k C_{\Phi,T} C_{H,T}}{\Gamma(k\zeta)} \Big(\frac{t}{2}\Big)^{-1+(k-1)\zeta} \\ \times \Big\{ \Big(2\Big(\frac{t}{2}\Big)^{\kappa/\alpha+\delta} + \Big(\frac{t}{2}\Big)^{2\kappa/\alpha} \Big) H_t^{(\kappa)}(x,y) + \Big(\frac{t}{2}\Big)^{2\delta} H_t^{(0)}(x,y) \Big\} \\ \leq \frac{3 C_1 C_{\Phi,T} C_{H,T} C_2^k}{\Gamma(k\zeta)} t^{-1+k\zeta} \Big\{ t^{\kappa/\alpha} H_t^{(\kappa)}(x,y) + t^{\delta} H_t^{(0)}(x,y) \Big\}.$$

From the inequality $u^{\zeta} \leq e^{(1-\varepsilon)u}$, $u > 0$, $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$, we get the estimate

$$\Gamma((k+1)\zeta) = \int_0^{\infty} e^{-u} u^{(k+1)\zeta - 1} du \leq \varepsilon^{-k\zeta} \Gamma(\zeta k).$$

Without loss of generality we assume that $\varepsilon^{-\zeta} \leq 2 \vee 2^{1/\alpha}$. Therefore, we arrive at

$$\Big| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Phi_{t/2}^{\circledast k}(x,z) \Phi_{t/2}(z,y)\, dz \Big| \leq \frac{C_1 C_4^{k+1}}{\Gamma(\zeta)\Gamma((k+1)\zeta)} t^{-1+k\zeta} \Big\{ t^{\kappa/\alpha} H_t^{(\kappa)}(x,y) + t^{\delta} H_t^{(0)}(x,y) \Big\}.$$

Adding the obtained estimate, we get (6.3) with $k+1$ instead of k.

In addition, for fixed $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ each term in the sum has a derivative in t, continuous in $(t,x) \in (0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$, and by (6.3) the series for the derivative is also uniformly convergent. Thus, Ψ has a derivative in t, which is continuous with respect to $(t,x) \in (0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R}^d$ and satisfies (6.4). □

In the above proof, in the case **C** we had to differentiate in t the term

$$b(\theta_t(y))$$

in the expression for $\Phi_t^2(x,y)$. If b does not belong to C^1, this term may not be continuously differentiable. Nevertheless, it is possible to show that the above result extends in a certain sense to the case when b is assumed to be Lipschitz continuous.

Lemma 6.3. *In case **C** of Theorem 2.1, the following statements hold true.*

1. *There exists a set $\Upsilon \subset (0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R}^d$ of zero Lebesgue measure such that the functions $\Phi_t^{\circledast k}(x,y)$, $k \geq 1$, and $\Psi_t(x,y)$ are differentiable in t for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $(t,y) \notin \Upsilon$.*

2. *For any $(t,y) \notin \Upsilon$, the time derivatives $\partial_t \Phi_t^{\circledast k}(x,y), k \geq 1$, and $\partial_t \Psi_t(x,y)$ are continuous in $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and satisfy (6.3), (6.4).*

Proof. Recall that by the Rademacher theorem (cf. [B02, Thm. VII.23.2]) the Lipschitz continuous function b has a derivative a.e. with respect to the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$. Denote by Υ_b the exceptional set of zero Lebesgue measure, such that b is differentiable at every point outside Υ_b. Since θ_t is a diffeomorphism of $\mathbb{R}^d$ (see Theorem I.2.3 and a comment in Chapter I §5 from [CL55]), the set $\Upsilon_{t,b} = \{y : \theta_t(y) \in \Upsilon_b\}$ is again of zero Lebesgue measure, and since $\partial_t \theta_t(y) = -b(\theta_t(y))$, the derivative $\partial_t b(\theta_t(y))$ is well defined for any $y \in \Upsilon_{t,b}$. This derivative is given by

$$\partial_t b(\theta_t(y)) = -\sum_{j=1}^{d} \partial_j b(\theta_t(y)) b_j(\theta_t(y)),$$

where the partial derivatives $\partial_j b$ are now well defined on Υ_b and bounded, because b is Lipschitz continuous. The term $b(\theta_t(y))$ comes in the expression for Φ in a multiplicative way, and all other terms have derivatives in t, and are continuous in (t, x, y). Hence, repeating the calculations from the proof of Lemma 6.1, we get the (part of) required statements for Φ, with the exceptional set

$$\Upsilon^1 = \{(t, y) : y \in \Upsilon_{t,b}\}.$$

Further, it is easy to get by induction the same statements for $\Phi^{\circledast k}, k \geq 2$, with the exceptional set

$$\Upsilon = \Upsilon^1 \bigcup \left\{ (0, \infty) \times \{y : \int_0^\infty 1_{y \in \Upsilon_{s,b}}\, ds > 0\} \right\}.$$

Indeed, by (6.5)

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\Phi^{\circledast(k+1)}_{t+\triangle t}(x, y) - \Phi^{\circledast(k+1)}_t(x, y)}{\triangle t} &= \int_0^{t/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\Phi^{\circledast k}_{t+\triangle t-s}(x, z) - \Phi^{\circledast k}_{t-s}(x, z)}{\triangle t} \Phi_s(z, y) dz ds \\
&+ \frac{1}{\triangle t} \int_{t/2}^{(t+\triangle t)/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Phi^{\circledast k}_{t+\triangle t-s}(x, z) \Phi_s(z, y) dz ds \\
&+ \int_0^{t/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Phi^{\circledast k}_s(x, z) \frac{\Phi_{t+\triangle t-s}(z, y) - \Phi_{t-s}(z, y)}{\triangle t} dz ds \\
&+ \frac{1}{\triangle t} \int_{t/2}^{(t+\triangle t)/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Phi^{\circledast k}_s(x, z) \Phi_{t+\triangle t-s}(z, y) dz ds.
\end{aligned}$$

Observe that if $(t, y) \notin \Upsilon$ then the respective ratios under the first and the third integrals converge ds-a.e. to the derivatives $(\partial_t \Phi^{\circledast k})_{t-s}(x, z)$ and $\partial_t \Phi_{t-s}(z, y)$, and the functions $\Phi^{\circledast k}_{t+\triangle t-s}(x, z)$ and $\Phi_{t+\triangle t-s}(z, y)$ converge, respectively, to $\Phi^{\circledast k}_{t-s}(x, z)$ and $\Phi_{t-s}(z, y)$. Then the convergence of the integrals follows by dominated convergence theorem and estimates (6.3) and (3.35). Hence, the derivative $\partial_t \Phi^{\circledast(k+1)}_t(x, y)$ exists and admits representation (6.6). The bound (6.3) for it follows by induction. Its continuity in x also follows by induction and the dominated convergence theorem.

Similarly, one can obtain the required statement for Ψ. Recall that $\Psi_t(x, y)$ is given by (uniformly convergent) series, and for each term both its differentiability in t and the bound (6.3) are proved for $(t, y) \notin \Upsilon$. Then by the dominated convergence theorem we get the same properties for the whole sum. To get the continuity with respect to x, we again use the dominated convergence theorem. □

The estimates on the derivatives we just obtained allow us to verify easily assertions (4.21), (4.22), which played the crucial role in the proof of Theorem 2.3 and Proposition 2.1.

Lemma 6.4. *1. For any $f \in C_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$,*

$$\|\partial_t P_{t,\varepsilon} f - \partial_t P_t f\|_\infty \to 0, \quad \varepsilon \to 0,$$

uniformly on compact subsets of $(0,\infty)$. Moreover, $\partial_t P_t f(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \partial_t p_t(x,y) f(y) dy$.

2. Under the assumptions of Proposition 2.1,

$$\partial_t p_{t,\varepsilon}(x,y) \to \partial_t p_t(x,y) \quad as \quad \varepsilon \to 0,$$

uniformly on compact subsets of $(0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$;

Proof. The proofs of both statements rely on the decomposition (6.1). We prove the first statement; the proof of the second statement is completely similar.

Using (6.1) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} p_{t,\varepsilon}(x,y) f(y) dy = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \partial_t p_{t,\varepsilon}(x,y) f(y) dy = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \partial_t p^0_{t+\varepsilon}(x,y) f(y)\, dy \\
+ \int_0^{t/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\partial_t p^0)_{t-s+\varepsilon}(x,z) \Psi_s(z,y) f(y)\, dzdyds \\
+ \int_0^{t/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} p^0_{s+\varepsilon}(x,z) (\partial_t \Psi)_{t-s}(z,y) f(y)\, dzdyds \\
+ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} p^0_{t/2+\varepsilon}(x,z) \Psi_{t/2}(z,y) f(y)\, dzdy.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.7}$$

Note that for every positive $t_0 < t_1$

$$p^0_{t+\varepsilon}(x,y) \to p^0_t(x,y), \quad \partial_t p^0_{t+\varepsilon}(x,y) \to \partial_t p^0_t(x,y), \quad \varepsilon \to 0,$$

uniformly in $t \in [t_0, t_1], x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Now the required convergence follows from (6.7) and the bounds for $p^0, \Psi, \partial_t p^0, \partial_t \Psi$ obtained above. □

6.3 Completion of the proof of Theorem 2.6

Now we can finalize the proof of Theorem 2.6. Again, we consider only a most cumbersome Case **C** with b being Lipschitz continuous.

By representation (6.1), the first two statements of the theorem follow from the statements given above on time derivatives of $p^0_t(x,y)$ and $\Psi_t(x,y)$; the proofs are completely analogous to those of Lemma 6.3, and therefore are omitted. To prove statement 3, note that the set Υ constructed in Lemma 6.3 is such that for every fixed $t > 0$ the set $\{y : (t,y) \in \Upsilon\}$ has zero Lebesgue measure. Together with the bounds for $\partial_t p_t(x,y)$ from statement 2, this makes it possible to use the dominated convergence theorem and prove that for given $t > 0$ and $f \in C_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$

$$\frac{P_{t+\triangle t} f(x) - P_t f(x)}{\triangle t} \to \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \partial_t p_t(x,y) f(y)\, dy, \quad \triangle t \to 0,$$

uniformly in $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, which gives statement 3. □

Remark 6.1. In the above proof of Theorem 2.6, which is based on (6.1) and consequent parametrix-type iteration of convolutions, we are strongly motivated by the idea used in the proof of Theorem 3.1 in [Ko00]. According to this idea, we decompose the $\circledast$-convolution in two parts in such a way, that after such a decomposition the time derivative is applied to the "least singular" function under the integral, as it was done in (6.1) – (6.6). Unfortunately, we cannot proceed in the same may with the derivative ∂_x unless $p^0_t(x,y)$ depends on t and $x-y$ only. It seems that in this place in [Ko00] there is a mistake hidden in the calculations, because in this part of the proof the respective (space) convolutions are treated as if they only depend on the difference of space arguments, but in fact their structure is more complicated. Therefore we do not use the above argument from [Ko00] for the derivative ∂_x, and develop another way to justify the whole method.

7 Proof of Theorem 2.5

Since the function $V_t(x)$ (cf. (2.16)) is bounded, the upper bound in (2.21) follow just by the definition of $p^{(0)}_t(x,y)$ and (2.4).

Let us prove the lower bound. First we observe that if we manage to prove the lower bound for *some* $T>0$, then we actually can do that for *all* $T>0$. This follows directly from the super-convolution property of the kernel $H^{(0)}_t(x,y)$ at the right hand side of (2.21) and the Chapmen-Kolmogorov identity (that is, the convolution identity) for $p_t(x,y)$ at the left hand side.

Note that for $|\omega(t,y)-x|\le t^{1/\alpha}$ we have by (3.37)

$$|r_t(x,y)|\le C\big(t^{\kappa/\alpha}+t^{\delta}\big)H^{(0)}_t(x,y). \tag{7.1}$$

Therefore, by (2.4) and (7.1) we get

$$p_t(x,y)\asymp t^{-d/\alpha},\quad t\in(0,T],\quad |\omega(t,y)-x|\le t^{1/\alpha}. \tag{7.2}$$

Further, by (2.15) and (2.16) there exists $\rho\in(0,1)$ small, such that if $t^{1/\alpha}\le|\omega(t,y)-x|\le\rho$ then

$$|r_t(x,y)|\le 2^{-1}p^{(0)}_t(x,y). \tag{7.3}$$

This implies

$$p_t(x,y)\ge 2^{-1}p^{(0)}_t(x,y),\quad t\in(0,T],\quad t^{1/\alpha}\le|\omega(t,y)-x|\le\rho. \tag{7.4}$$

Let us show that there exists $c>0$ such that

$$p_t(x,y)\ge\frac{ct}{|\omega(t,y)-x|^{d+\alpha}},\quad t\in(0,T],\quad |\omega(t,y)-x|>\rho. \tag{7.5}$$

Consider the set

$$D=\Big\{(s,z):|\omega(t-s,y)-z|<t^{1/\alpha}\Big\}\subset[0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^d,$$

and denote

$$\tau=\inf\{s:(s,X_s)\in D\}.$$

If $\tau \le t/2$, then we have $|\omega(t-\tau, y) - X_\tau| \le t^{1/\alpha}$, $t - \tau > t/2$, hence by the strong Markov property and (7.2) we have

$$p_t(x,y) \ge \mathbb{E}_x \left[p_{t-\tau}(X_\tau, y) 1_{\tau \le t/2} \right] \ge c t^{-d/\alpha} \mathbb{P}_x(\tau \le t/2).$$

To estimate $\mathbb{P}_x(\tau \le t/2)$, we introduce another stopping time σ in the following way. Up to now, $T > 0$ was fixed but arbitrary. Now we take another $T_1 > 0$ small enough, so that

$$t^{1/\alpha} \le \frac{\rho}{3}, \quad |\omega(t-s,y) - \omega(t,y)| < \frac{\rho}{3}, \quad 0 \le s \le t \le T_1, \quad y \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Here in the second inequality we have used that

$$\partial_t \omega(t,y) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{in case } \mathbf{A}, \\ -b(y), & \text{in case } \mathbf{B}, \\ -b(\theta_t(y)), & \text{in case } \mathbf{C}, \end{cases} \tag{7.6}$$

and thus $\partial_t \omega(t,y)$ is bounded. Define

$$\sigma = \inf \left\{ s : |X_s - x| \ge \frac{\rho}{3} \right\} \wedge \left(\frac{t}{2} \right),$$

then $\sigma \le t/2$, and if $t \le T_1$ for every $s < \sigma$ we have

$$|\omega(t,y) - x| \le |\omega(t-s,y) - X_s| + |X_s - x| + |\omega(t,y) - \omega(t,y)| < |\omega(t,y) - X_s| + \frac{2\rho}{3}, \tag{7.7}$$

and because $|\omega(t,y) - x| > \rho$, we have $|\omega(t,y) - X_s| > \rho/3 > t^{1/\alpha}$, i.e. $(s, X_s) \notin D$. Hence

$$\{\tau \le t/2\} \supset \{(\sigma, X_\sigma) \in D\}. \tag{7.8}$$

Take $f \in C^2_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $f(z) \in [0,1]$,

$$f(z) = \begin{cases} 1, & |z| \le 2^{-1} t^{-1/\alpha} \\ 0, & |z| > t^{-1/\alpha}, \end{cases}$$

and for a fixed $t \le T_1, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ consider the function $F(s,z) = f(\omega(t,y) - z)$. Then by the Itô formula and Doob's optional sampling theorem applied to the bounded stopping time σ, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_x F(\sigma, X_\sigma) = F(0,x) + \mathbb{E}_x \int_0^\sigma \Big(L_x F(s, X_s) + F'_s(s, X_s) \Big)\, ds.$$

where

$$F'_s(s, X_s) = \Big(\nabla f(\omega(t-s,y)), \partial_s \omega(t-s,y) \Big),$$

see (7.6) for the formula for $\partial_t \omega(t,y)$. Now we recall that

(i) $F \le 1$, and $F(\sigma, X_\sigma) = 0$ if $(\sigma, X_\sigma) \notin D$;

(ii) for every $s < \sigma$, $|X_\sigma - x| < \rho/3$, and therefore by the calculation (7.7) we have $|\omega(t-s,y) - X_s| > t^{1/\alpha}$, which yields that

$$F(s, X_s) = 0, \quad \nabla_x F(s, X_s) = 0, \quad F'_s(s, X_s) = 0.$$

Hence by (7.8) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}_x(\tau \le t/2) &\ge \mathbb{E}_x \int_0^\sigma a(X_s) L_x^{(\alpha)} F(s, X_s)\, ds \\ &= \mathbb{E}_x \left[\int_0^\sigma a(X_s) \int_{|\omega(t-s,y)-(X_s+u)|\le t^{1/\alpha}} \frac{c_\alpha}{|u|^{d+\alpha}}\, du ds \right] \\ &\ge c\mathbb{E}_x \int_0^\sigma \frac{t^{d/\alpha}}{|\omega(t-s,y)-X_s|^{d+\alpha}}\, ds.\end{aligned}$$

Observe that by (7.7) $|\omega(t-s,y)-X_s| \ge 3^{-1}|\omega(t,y)-x|$, hence

$$\mathbb{P}_x(\tau \le t/2) \ge \frac{Ct^{d/\alpha+1}}{|\omega(t,y)-x|^{d+\alpha}} \mathbb{P}_x\left(\sigma > \frac{t}{4}\right).$$

It is easy to verify that by choosing T_1 small enough we can ensure that $\mathbb{P}_x(\sigma > t/4) > 1/2$ for $t < T_1, x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Summarizing all the calculations above we get the required bound (7.5). □

Appendix A: Proof of Proposition 3.2

Estimate (3.6) for the α-stable transition probability density is well known, see, for example, [PT69], [St10a]–[St11], [W07]; see also [Zo86] for the asymptotic behaviour of an α-stable distribution density in the one-dimensional case. The approach used e.g. in [W07] to prove this estimate can be used also to prove (3.7) – (3.10); for the sake of completeness, we outline these proofs below.

Recall that $g^{(\alpha)}$ is the distribution density of $Z_1^{(\alpha)}$, and $Z_1^{(\alpha)}$ can be decomposed into the sum of independent random variables with the characteristic functions $e^{-\varphi(\xi)}, e^{-|\xi|^\alpha+\varphi(\xi)}$, respectively,

$$\varphi(\xi) := c_\alpha \int_{|u|\le 1} (1-\cos(\xi,u)) \frac{du}{|u|^{d+\alpha}}.$$

The first random variable, by the inverse Fourier transform, possesses the distribution density

$$f(x) = (2\pi)^{-d/\alpha} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-i(x,\xi)-\varphi(\xi)} d\xi.$$

The second one possess the compound Poisson distribution

$$G(du) := e^{-\Lambda(\mathbb{R}^d)} \sum_{m=0}^\infty \frac{\Lambda^{*m}(du)}{m!}, \quad \text{where} \quad \Lambda(du) := \frac{c_\alpha}{|u|^{d+\alpha}} \mathbf{1}_{|u|>1} du.$$

Then $g^{(\alpha)}(x)$ can be written as

$$g^{(\alpha)}(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x-u) G(du), \tag{7.9}$$

and this is the representation we use in order to derive (3.6) – (3.10) in a unified way.

It can be verified directly that

$$G(du) = e^{-\Lambda(\mathbb{R}^d)}\big(\delta_0(u) + m(u)du\big), \tag{7.10}$$

where $m(u) \asymp |u|^{-d-\alpha} \wedge 1$; see also [Om06]. On the other hand, it can be shown (see [K13, Lem. 2]) that

$$|\nabla^k f(x)| \le Ce^{-c|x|}, \quad k \ge 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{7.11}$$

where $C, c > 0$ are some constants. Hence, by using (7.9), (7.10) and (7.11), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \Big|\nabla^k g^{(\alpha)}(x)\Big| &= e^{-\Lambda(\mathbb{R}^d)}\Big|\nabla^k f(x) + \int_{|x-u|\ge 1} f(u)\nabla_x^k m(x-u)du\Big| \\ &\le C\Big(e^{-c|x|} + \int_{|x-u|\ge 1} e^{-c|u|}\frac{du}{|x-u|^{d+\alpha+k}}\Big). \end{aligned} \tag{7.12}$$

To estimate the integral in the right-hand side of the above estimate, take x with $|x| \ge 2$, and split

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{|x-u|\ge 1} e^{-c|u|}\frac{du}{|x-u|^{d+\alpha+k}} &= \left(\int_{1\le|x-u|\le|x|/2} + \int_{|x|\le|x-u|}\right)\frac{e^{-c|u|}}{|x-u|^{d+\alpha+k}}du \\ &\le \int_{|u-x|\ge 1} 1_{|x|/2\le|u|\le 3|x|/2}\frac{e^{-c|u|}}{|x-u|^{d+\alpha+k}}du + \int_{|x-u|\ge|x|/2}\frac{e^{-c|u|}}{|x-u|^{d+\alpha+k}}du \\ &\le C\int_{|x|/2\le|u|\le 3|x|/2} e^{-c|u|}du + \frac{C}{|x|^{d+\alpha+k}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-c|u|}du \\ &\le Ce^{-c|x|/2} + \frac{C}{|x|^{d+\alpha+k}}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\Big|\nabla^k g^{(\alpha)}(x)\Big| \le C\Big(e^{-c|x|} + |x|^{-d-k-\alpha} \wedge 1\Big) \asymp G^{(\alpha+k)}(x). \tag{7.13}$$

which proves (3.7) and (3.10).

Next, recall that $g_t^{(\alpha)}(y-x) = \frac{1}{t^{d/\alpha}}g^{(\alpha)}\big(\frac{y-x}{t^{1/\alpha}}\big)$ is the transition probability density of $Z^{(\alpha)}$, and therefore

$$L^{(\alpha)}g_t^{(\alpha)}(x) = \partial_t g_t^{(\alpha)}(x) = -\frac{d}{\alpha t^{d/\alpha+1}}g^{(\alpha)}\Big(\frac{x}{t^{1/\alpha}}\Big) - \frac{1}{\alpha t^{(d+1)/\alpha+1}}\Big(x, \nabla g^{(\alpha)}\Big(\frac{x}{t^{1/\alpha}}\Big)\Big). \tag{7.14}$$

Now (3.8) follows from (7.9) and (7.14) with $t = 1$. Taking one more derivative in x in (7.14), taking $t = 1$, and further applying (7.12), we get (3.9). □

Appendix B: Proof of Propositions 3.3 and 3.4

Proof of Proposition 3.3. We prove the sub-convolution property, only: the proof of the super-convolution one is completely analogous and is omitted. We consider the cases **A** – **C** separately. In what follows, we fix $\lambda \in [0, \alpha)$, and omit it in the notation, i.e write $H_t(x, y)$ instead of $H_t^{(\lambda)}(x, y)$.

*Case **A**.* Note that in case **A** the kernel $H_t(x,y)$ depends on the difference $y-x$, only, which immediately gives (3.33). Let us show the sub-convolution property. Define

$$K_t(x) := H_t(0,x).$$

Note that

$$K_t(x) \le \frac{1}{t^{d/\alpha}} G^{(\alpha-\lambda)}\left(\frac{x}{t^{1/\alpha}}\right), \tag{7.15}$$

and

$$K_t(x) = \frac{1}{t^{d/\alpha}} G^{(\alpha-\lambda)}\left(\frac{x}{t^{1/\alpha}}\right) \quad \text{if} \quad |x| \le 1. \tag{7.16}$$

On the other hand, by (3.6) we have $g_t^{(\alpha-\lambda)}(x) \asymp \frac{1}{t^{d/\alpha}} G^{(\alpha-\lambda)}\left(\frac{x}{t^{1/\alpha}}\right)$. Since the function $g_t^{(\alpha)}(y-x)$ is the transition probability density of an $(\alpha-\lambda)$ –stable process $Z^{(\alpha-\lambda)}$, it possesses the convolution property

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g_{t-s}^{(\alpha-\lambda)}(z) g_s^{(\alpha-\lambda)}(x-z)dz = g_t^{(\alpha-\lambda)}(x).$$

Therefore, if $|x| \le 1$, we have

$$(K_{t-s} * K_s)(x) \le C K_{(t-s)^{1-\lambda/\alpha}+s^{1-\lambda/\alpha}}(x)$$

with the constant $C>0$ depending on α, λ, and d only. Observe that

$$t^{1-\lambda/\alpha} \le (t-s)^{1-\lambda/\alpha} + s^{1-\lambda/\alpha} \le 2t^{1-\lambda/\alpha}, \quad 0 \le s \le t.$$

Thus, it follows from the explicit representation for $G^{(\alpha-\lambda)}(x)$, (3.3) and (7.16), that

$$\big(K_{t-s} * K_s\big)(x) \le C K_t(x), \quad |x| \le 1.$$

Consider now the case $|x|>1$. Split

$$\big(K_{t-s} * K_s\big)(x) \le \Big(\int_{|z|\ge |x|/2} + \int_{|y-z|\ge |x|/2}\Big) K_{t-s}(z) K_s(y-z)dz.$$

Note that $K_t(x)$ is a monotone function of $|x|$. In addition, it depends on $|x|$ in a piece-wise power-type way and therefore it possesses the same property formulated in statement 1 of Proposition 3.1 for the function $G^{(\lambda)}$. Then

$$K_{t-s}(z) \le K_{t-s}(x/2) \le c K_{t-s}(x), \quad |z| \ge |x|/2.$$

For $|x| \ge 1$ we have $K_t(x) = t^{1-\lambda/\alpha}|x|^{-d-\alpha}$, and thus

$$K_{t-s}(x) = (t-s)^{1-\lambda/\alpha}|x|^{-d-\alpha} \le (t-s)^{1-\lambda/\alpha} t^{-1+\lambda/\alpha} K_t(x) \le K_t(x), \quad |x| \ge 1.$$

Then for $|x| \ge 1$

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{|z|\ge |x|/2} K_{t-s}(z) K_s(y-z)\,dz &\le c K_t(x) \int_{|z|\ge |x|/2} K_s(y-z)\,dz \\ &\le c K_t(x) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} K_s(z')\,dz' \le C K_t(x),\end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we used (7.15) and (3.33). Similarly,

$$\int_{|y-z|\geq|x|/2} K_{t-s}(z)K_s(y-z)dz \leq CK_t(x), \quad |x|\geq 1.$$

Summarizing the estimates proved above, we derive the required sub-convolution property for $H_t(x,y)$.

Case $\boldsymbol{B}$. Denote for $q\in[0,1]$

$$K_t^{(q)}(x,y) = K_t\Big(y - qb(x)t - (1-q)b(y)t - x\Big);$$

observe that now $H_t(x,y) = K_t^{(0)}(x,y)$.

Let us prove the following statement: For a given $T>0$ there exist c, C such that for every $q\in[0,1]$

$$cK_t^{(q)}(x,y) \leq K_t(y - tb(y) - x) \leq CK_t^{(q)}(x,y), \quad t\in(0,T]. \tag{7.17}$$

We prove only the first inequality, the proof of the second one is completely analogous. Consider two cases: $|x-y|>2Bt$ and $|x-y|\leq 2Bt$, where $B=\sup_x|b(x)|$. In the first case, we have

$$|y-x-b(y)t| \geq \frac{1}{2}|y-x|, \quad |y-x-qb(x)t-(1-q)b(y)t| \leq \frac{3}{2}|y-x|. \tag{7.18}$$

Then by the analogue of (3.3) for $K_t(x)$ we get the first inequality in (7.17).

Consider the case $|x-y|\leq 2Bt$. Then we have

$$|b(x)-b(y)| \leq ct^{\gamma}. \tag{7.19}$$

Since in case **B** we have $1+\gamma > 1/\alpha$, by the triangle inequality we get

$$\begin{aligned}\Big|\frac{y-z-tb(y)}{t^{1/\alpha}}\Big|^{\lambda} \vee 1 &\leq C\Big(\Big|\frac{y-z-tb(y)-qt(b(x)-b(y))}{t^{1/\alpha}}\Big|^{\lambda}\vee 1\Big) + C\\ &\leq C\Big(\Big|\frac{y-z-tb(y)-qt(b(x)-b(y))}{t^{1/\alpha}}\Big|^{\lambda}\vee 1\Big), \quad t\leq T.\end{aligned}$$

Note that for any $C\geq 1, A\geq 0$

$$(CA)\vee t^{-1/\alpha} \leq C(A\vee t^{-1/\alpha}),$$

hence we can finalize the above estimate in the following way:

$$\frac{K_t^{(0)}(x,y)}{K_t^{(q)}(x,y)} \leq C\frac{g^{(\alpha-\lambda)}(v)}{g^{(\alpha-\lambda)}(u)},$$

where

$$u = \frac{y-x-b(y)t}{t^{1/\alpha}}, \quad v = \frac{y-x-qb(x)t-(1-q)b(y)t}{t^{1/\alpha}}.$$

Note that the logarithmic derivative of $g^{(\alpha-\lambda)}(x)$ is bounded; see (3.6), (3.7). Then

$$\frac{g^{(\alpha-\lambda)}(v)}{g^{(\alpha-\lambda)}(u)} \le e^{c|u-v|}, \quad u, v \in \mathbb{R}^d, \tag{7.20}$$

which implies

$$\frac{K_t^{(0)}(x,y)}{K_t^{(q)}(x,y)} \le C \exp\left[cq|b(x)-b(y)|t^{-1/\alpha+1}\right]. \tag{7.21}$$

Since for $|x-y| \le 2Bt$ we have (7.19), we can estimate the right-hand side of (7.21) by $C\exp\left[ct^{-1/\alpha+1+\gamma}\right]$, which is bounded for $t \in [0,T]$ since $\alpha > (1+\gamma)^{-1}$. This completes the proof of (7.17).

Now we can finalize the proof in case **B**. By (7.17) with $q=1$,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} H_{t-s}(x,z)H_s(z,y)\,dz &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} K_{t-s}^{(0)}(x,z)K_s^{(0)}(z,y)\,dz \\ &\le C\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} K_{t-s}^{(1)}(x,z)K_s^{(0)}(z,y)\,dz = C\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} K_{t-s}(z-x')K_s(y'-z)\,dz,\end{aligned} \tag{7.22}$$

where

$$x' = x + (t-s)b(x), \quad y' = y - sb(y).$$

The sub-convolution property of the kernel $K_t(y-x)$ was actually shown in the proof of case **A**, hence

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} H_{t-s}(x,z)H_s(z,y)\,dz \le CK_t(y'-x') = CK_t^{(1-s/t)}(x,y). \tag{7.23}$$

Applying (7.17) with $q = 1-s/t$, we complete the proof of the required sub-convolution property for $H_t(x,y)$ in case **B**. Finally, applying (7.17) with $q=1$ we get estimates (3.33).

Case **C**. The scheme of the proof in this case is similar to that one in the case **B**. Denote for $q \in [0,1]$

$$\tilde{K}_t^{(q)}(x,y) = K_t\Big(\chi_{qt}(\theta_t(y)) - \chi_{qt}(x)\Big).$$

Observe that $\tilde{K}_t^{(0)}(x,y) \equiv K_t(\theta_t(y)-x)$ is the kernel in case **C**. As in case **B**, let us show that

$$c\tilde{K}^{(q)}(x,y) \le K_t(\theta_t(y)-x) \le C\tilde{K}^{(q)}(x,y), \quad t \in (0,T]. \tag{7.24}$$

Suppose first that $b \in C_b^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$. In this case, every $\chi_t(x)$ is differentiable in x, and the respective derivative $D_t(x) := \nabla_x \chi_t(x)$ satisfies the following linear ODE (cf. [CL55, Ch. I, (7.12)–(7.14)])

$$\frac{d}{dt}D_t(x) = B(t,x)D_t(x), \quad B(t,x) := \big(\nabla b\big)(\chi_t(x)).$$

In addition, $D_0(x)$ is the identity matrix. Similar relations hold true for the inverse flow, since θ_t is the solution to (2.12), which differs from (2.11) by the sign "-". Then $\nabla_x\theta_t(x) = D_t^{-1}(x)$, where $D_t^{-1}(x)$ is the inverse matrix of $D_t(x)$, and

$$\frac{d}{dt}D_t^{-1}(x) = \tilde{B}(t,x)D_t^{-1}(x), \quad \tilde{B}(t,x) := -\big(\nabla b\big)(\theta_t(x)).$$

Hence, we have the following bounds for the matrix norms of $D_t(x)$ and $D_t^{-1}(x)$:

$$\|D_t(x)\| \le C_{b,T}, \quad \left\| \Big(D_t(x) \Big)^{-1} \right\| \le C_{b,T}, \quad t \in (0,T]. \tag{7.25}$$

Note that the constant $C_{b,T}$ here depends only on T and on the supremum of the matrix norm of ∇b. Using these inequalities, we derive

$$C_{b,T}^{-1}|\theta_t(y) - x| \le |\chi_{qt}(\theta_t(y)) - \chi_{qt}(x)| \le C_{b,T}|\theta_t(y) - x|, \quad q \in [0,1],\, t \in (0,T].$$

Then since $\theta_t(y) - x = \big(\chi_{qt}(\theta_t(y)) - \chi_{qt}(x)\big)\big|_{q=0}$, we derive (7.24) by the property of K_t (cf. the explanation in the case **A**). Note that

$$\theta_s(y) - \chi_{t-s}(x) = \chi_{t-s}\big(\theta_t(y)\big) - \chi_{t-s}(x) = \chi_{(1-s/t)t}\big(\theta_t(y)\big) - \chi_{(1-s/t)t}(x).$$

Then we derive (7.22) and (7.23) with $\tilde{K}_{t-s}^{(q)}(\cdot,\cdot)$ instead of $K_t^{(q)}(\cdot,\cdot)$, with $q = 0, 1$ and $1 - s/t$, respectively, and

$$x' = \chi_{t-s}(x), \quad y' = \theta_s(y).$$

Then applying finally (7.24) with $q = 1 - s/t$ we derive the sub-convolution property of $H_t(x,y)$. Applying (7.24) with $q = 1$ we get (3.33), which finalized the proof of the proposition in case **C** if $b \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

To handle the Lipschitz case one can approximate b uniformly by a sequence of functions $b_n \in C_b^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ in such a way that the matrix norms of ∇b_n remains uniformly bounded. □

Proof of Proposition 3.4. a) Without loss of generality assume that $f \in C_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is non-negative. Then in case **A** we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g_t^{(\alpha)}(y - x) f(y)dy = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g_t^{(\alpha)}(z) f(z + x)dz \to 0, \quad |x| \to \infty.$$

In case **B** we have by (7.17)

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g_t^{(\alpha)}(y - tb(y) - x) f(y)dy &\le C \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g_t^{(\alpha)}(y - tb(x) - x) f(y)dy \\ &= C \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g_t^{(\alpha)}(z) f(z + x + tb(x))dz \to 0, \quad |x| \to \infty, \end{aligned} \tag{7.26}$$

because $b(\cdot)$ is bounded, and $f \in C_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

Analogously, in case **C** we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g_t^{(\alpha)}(\theta_t(y) - x) f(y)dy &\le C \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g_t^{(\alpha)}(y - \chi_t(x)) f(y)dy \\ &= C \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g_t^{(\alpha)}(z) f(z + \chi_t(x))dz \to 0, \quad |x| \to \infty, \end{aligned}$$

because $|\chi_t(x)| = \big|x + \int_0^t b(\chi_s(x))ds\big| \to \infty$, $|x| \to \infty$.

b) In case **A** the statement follows from the fact that $g_t^{(\alpha)}(y-x)$ is the fundamental solution to the Cauchy problem for $\partial_t - L^{(\alpha)}$, in particular,

$$\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^d}\left|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g_t^{(\alpha)}(y-x)f(y)dy - f(x)\right| \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad t\to 0. \tag{7.27}$$

In case **B** we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g_t^{(\alpha)}(y-tb(y)-x)f(y)dy - f(x)\Big| \\
&\qquad \le C\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\Big|g_t^{(\alpha)}(y-tb(y)-x) - g_t^{(\alpha)}(y-tb(x)-x)\Big|dy \\
&\qquad\quad + \Big|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g_t^{(\alpha)}(y-x-tb(x))f(y)dy - f(x)\Big| =: J_1(t,x)+J_2(t,x).
\end{aligned} \tag{7.28}$$

Note that by (3.7)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big|g_t^{(\alpha)}(y-tb(y)-x) - g_t^{(\alpha)}(y-tb(x)-x)\Big| \\
&\qquad \le t\int_0^1 \left|\frac{(b(y)-b(x))}{t^{1/\alpha}}\frac{1}{t^{d/\alpha}}\Big(\nabla g^{(\alpha)}\Big)\left(\frac{y-x-tb(x)-st(b(y)-b(x))}{t^{1/\alpha}}\right)\right| ds \\
&\qquad \le Ct\int_0^1 \frac{|y-x|^\gamma}{t^{1/\alpha}}\frac{1}{t^{d/\alpha}}G^{(\alpha+1)}\left(\frac{y-x-tb(x)-st(b(y)-b(x))}{t^{1/\alpha}}\right) ds \\
&\qquad \le Ct\frac{|y-x|^\gamma}{t^{1/\alpha}}\frac{1}{t^{d/\alpha}}G^{(\alpha+1)}\left(\frac{y-x-tb(x)}{t^{1/\alpha}}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last line we used that the estimate (7.17) also holds true for $\frac{1}{t^{d/\alpha}}G^{(\alpha+1)}\Big(\frac{\cdot}{t^{1/\alpha}}\Big)$ instead of $K_t(\cdot)$. Using the triangle inequality, (3.4) and (3.6), we derive

$$\Big|g_t^{(\alpha)}(y-tb(y)-x) - g_t^{(\alpha)}(y-tb(x)-x)\Big| \le C\big(t^{1+\gamma-1/\alpha}+t^{1-1/\alpha+\gamma/\alpha}\big)g_t^{(\alpha)}(y-x-tb(x)).$$

Since in case **B** we assumed that $\alpha > (1+\gamma)^{-1}$, we have $\alpha > 1-\gamma$. Thus,

$$\sup_x J_1(t,x) \le C\big(t^{1+\gamma-1/\alpha}+t^{1-1/\alpha+\gamma/\alpha}\big)\to 0, \quad t\to 0.$$

For $J_2(t,x)$ we have under the additional assumption that $f\in C^1_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$

$$J_2(t,x) = \left|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g_t^{(\alpha)}(z)\big(f(z+x+tb(x))-f(x)\big)dy\right| \le Ct\to 0, \quad t\to 0,$$

uniformly in x. The general case $f\in C_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ follows by the approximation argument. This completes the proof in case **B**.

In case **C** the argument is similar. We split

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g_t^{(\alpha)}(\theta_t(y)-x)f(y)dy - f(x)\Big| \\
&\qquad \le C\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\Big|g_t^{(\alpha)}(\theta_t(y)-x) - g_t^{(\alpha)}(y-\chi_t(x))\Big|dy \\
&\qquad\quad + \Big|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g_t^{(\alpha)}(y-\chi_t(x))f(y)dy - f(x)\Big| =: J_1(t,x)+J_2(t,x).
\end{aligned} \tag{7.29}$$

Using (3.7), (3.6) and (7.24), we get

$$\begin{aligned}\Big|g_t^{(\alpha)}(\theta_t(y)-x)-g_t^{(\alpha)}(y-\chi_t(x))\Big| \\ &\le t\int_0^1 \left|\frac{b(\chi_{qt}(\theta_t(y)))-b(\chi_{qt}(x))}{t^{1/\alpha}}\frac{1}{t^{d/\alpha}}\Big(\nabla g^{(\alpha)}\Big)\left(\frac{\chi_{qt}(\theta_t(y))-\chi_{qt}(x)}{t^{1/\alpha}}\right)\right| dq \\ &\le Ctg_t^{(\alpha)}(y-\chi_t(x)),\end{aligned}$$

which implies that $\sup_x J_1(t,x)\to 0$ as $t\to 0$.

For $J_2(t,x)$ we have by the same argument as in case **C**

$$J_2(t,x)=\left|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g_t^{(\alpha)}(z)\big(f(z+\chi_t(x))-f(x)\big)dy\right|\to 0,\quad t\to 0,$$

uniformly in x . This finishes the proof in case **C**. □

Acknowledgement. We thank thank R. Schilling, A. Kochubei and A.Kohatsu-Higa for inspiring discussions and helpful remarks. We are very grateful to the anonymous referees whose comments and remarks helped us to improve the paper. We gratefully acknowledge the DFG Grant Schi 419/8-1; the first-named author gratefully acknowledges the Scholarship of the President of Ukraine for young scientists (2012-2014).

References

[BK14] V. Bally, A. Kohatsu-Higa. A probabilistic interpretation of the parametrix method. To appear in *Ann. Appl. Probab.*

[Ba88] R.F. Bass, Uniqueness in Law for Pure Jump Markov Processes. *Probab. Th. Rel. Fields* **79** (1988) 271–287.

[BC03] R.F. Bass, Z.-Q. Chen, Brownian motion with singular drift. *Ann. Probab.* **31(2)** (2003), 279–817.

[BC06] R.F. Bass, Z.-Q. Chen. Systems of equations driven by stable processes. *Probab. Th. Rel. Fields* **134(2)** (2006), 175–214.

[BBC04] R.F. Bass, K. Burdzy, Z.-Q. Chen. Stochastic differential equations driven by stable processes for which pathwise uniqueness fails. *Stoch. Proc. Appl.* **111(1)** (2004), 1–15

[BJ07] K. Bogdan, T. Jakubowski. Estimates of heat kernel of fractional Laplacian perturbed by gradient operators. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **271(1)** (2007), 179–198.

[B05] B. Böttcher. A parametrix construction for the fundamental solution of the evolution equation associated with a pseudo-differential operator generating a Markov process. *Math. Nachr.* **278** (2005), 1235–1241.

[Bo08] B. Böttcher. Construction of time inhomogeneous Markov processes via evolution equations using pseudo-differential operators. *J. London Math. Soc.* **78** (2008), 605–621.

[CSZ15] Z.-Q. Chen, R. Song, X. Zhang. Stochastic flows for Lévy process with Hölder drifts. Preprint 2015. Available at http://arxiv.org/pdf/1501.04758.pdf

[CW13] Z.-Q. Chen, L. Wang. Uniqueness of stable processes with drift. Preprint 2013. Available at http://arxiv.org/pdf/1309.6414v1.pdf

[CZ13] Z.-Q. Chen, X. Zhang. Heat kernels and analyticity of non-symmetric jump diffusion semigroups. To appear in *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields.*

[CL55] Earl A. Coddington, N. Levinson. *Theory of ordinary differential equations.* McGraw-Hill, 1955.

[DF13] A. Debussche, N. Fournier. Existence of densities for stable-like driven SDE's with Hölder continuous coefficients. *J. Funct. Anal.* **264 (8)** (2013), 1757–1778.

[B02] E. DiBenedetto. *Real Analysis.* Birkhäuser, Basel, 2002.

[Dr77] Ja. M. Drin'. Fundamental solution of the Cauchy problem for a class of parabolic pseudodifferential equations. (Ukrainian) *Dopov. Akad. Nauk Ukr. RSR, Ser. A* (1977), 198–203.

[ED81] Ja. M. Drin', S. D. Eidelman, Construction and investigation of classical fundamental solution of the Cauchy problem for uniformly parabolic pseudo-differential equations. (Russian) *Mat. Issled.* **63** (1981), 18–33.

[EIK04] S.D. Eidelman, S.D. Ivasyshen, A.N. Kochubei. *Analytic Methods in the Theory of Differential and Pseudo-Differential Equations of Parabolic Type.* Birkhäuser, Basel, 2004.

[EK86] S. N. Ethier, T. G. Kurtz. *Markov Processes: Characterization and Convergence.* Wiley, New York. 1986.

[Fe36] W. Feller. Zur Theorie der stochastischen Prozesse. (Existenz- und Eindeutigkeitssätze). *Math. Ann.* **113** (1936), 113–160.

[Fe71] W. Feller. An introduction to probability theory and its applications, Vol. 2. 2nd edition. Wiley, 1971.

[F13] N. Fournier. On pathwise uniqueness for stochastic differential equations driven by stable Lévy processes. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.,* **49**, 138-159, 2013.

[FP10] N. Fournier, J. Printems. Absolute continuity of some one-dimensional processes. *Bernoulli,* **16** (2010), 2, 343 – 360.

[Fr64] A. Friedman. *Partial differential equations of parabolic type.* Prentice-Hall, New-York, 1964.

[GK14] Iu. Ganychenko, A. Kulik. Rates of approximation of nonsmooth integral-type functionals of Markov processes. *Modern Stochastics: Theory and Appl.* **2** (2014), 117–126.

[GS82] I. I. Gikhman, A. V. Skorokhod. *Stochastic differential equations and their applications*. Naukova Dumka, Kiev, 1982.

[GS74] I. I. Gikhman, A. V. Skorokhod. *The theory of stochastic processes, Vol. II.* Springer, Berlin, 1974.

[Ho94] W. Hoh. The martingale problem for a class of pseudo differential operators. *Math. Ann.* **300(1)** (1994), 121–147.

[Ho95] W. Hoh. Pseudodifferential operators with negative definite symbols and the martingale problem. *Stoch. Stoch. Rep.* **55 (3-4)** (1995), 225–252.

[Ho98a] W. Hoh. *Pseudo differential operators generating Markov processes.* Habilitationsschrift, Bielefeld, 1998.

[Ho98b] W. Hoh. A symbolic calculus for pseudo differential operators generating Feller semigroups. *Osaka Math. J.* **35** (1998), 789–820.

[IW81] N. Ikeda, S. Watanabe. *Stochastic differential equations and diffision processes.* Kodansha, Tokyo, 1981.

[Iw77] Ch. Iwasaki (Tsutsumi). The fundamental solution for pseudo-differential operators of parabolic type. *Osaka Math. J.* **14(3)** (1977), 569–592.

[Ja94] N. Jacob. A class of Feller semigroups generated by pseudo differential operators. *Math. Z.* **215** (1994), 151–166.

[Ja96] N. Jacob. *Pseudo-differential operators and Markov processes.* Akademie Verlag, 1996.

[Ja01] N. Jacob. *Pseudo differential operators and Markov processes, I: Fourier analysis and semigroups.* Imperial College Press, London, 2001.

[Ja02] N. Jacob. *Pseudo differential operators and Markov processes, II: Generators and their potential theory.* Imperial College Press, London, 2002.

[Ja05] N. Jacob. *Pseudo differential operators and Markov processes, III: Markov Processes and Applications.* Imperial College Press, London, 2005.

[KS14] P. Kim, R. Song. Stable process with singular drift. *Stoch. Proc. Appl.* **124** (2-14), 2479–2516.

[K13] V. Knopova. Compound kernel estimates for the transition probability density of a Lévy process in $\mathbb{R}^n$. *Theory of Probab. and Math. Stat.* **89** (2014), 57–70.

[Ko89] A. N. Kochubei. Parabolic pseudo-differential equations, hypersingular integrals and Markov processes. *Math. URSS Izestija.* **33** (1989), 233–259.

[Ko00] V. N. Kolokoltsov. Symmetric stable laws and stable-like jump-diffusions. *Proc. London Math. Soc.* **80** (2000), 725–768.

[Ko84a] T. Komatsu. On the martingale problem for generators of stable processes with perturbations. Markov processes associated with certain integro-differential operators. *Osaka J. Math.* **21** (1984), 113–132

[Ko84b] T. Komatsu. Pseudo-differential operators and Markov processes. *J. Math. Soc. Japan* **36(3)** (1984), 387–418.

[Ku81] H. Kumano-go. *Pseudo-differential operators*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1981.

[KP91] T. G. Kurtz, P. Protter. Weak limit theorems for stochastic integrals and stochastic differential equations. *Ann. Probab.* **9 (3)**, (1991), 1035–1070.

[Le1907] E. E. Levi. Sulle equazioni lineari totalmente ellittiche alle derivate parziali. *Rend. del Circ. Mat.* **24 (1)** (1907), 275–317.

[MP92a] R. Mikulevicius, H. Pragarauskas. On the martingale problem associated with non-degenerate Lévy operators. *Lith. Math. J.* **32 (3)** (1992), 297–311.

[MP92b] R. Mikulevicius, H. Pragarauskas. On the Cauchy problem for certain integro-differential operators in Sobolev and Hölder spaces. *Lith. Math. J.* **32 (2)** (1992), 238–264.

[MP12a] R. Mikulevicius, H. Pragarauskas. On the Cauchy problem for integro-differential operators in Hölder classes and the uniqueness of the martingale problem. *Potential anal.* **40** (2014), 539–563.

[Om06] E. Omey. Subexponential distribution functions in $\mathbb{R}^d$. *J. Math. Sci.* **138(1)** (2006), 5434–5449.

[Po94] N. I. Portenko. Some perturbations of drift-type for symmetric stable processes. *Random Oper. Stoch. Equ.* **2(3)** (1994), 211–224.

[PP95] S. I. Podolynny, N. I. Portenko. On multidimensional stable processes with locally unbounded drift. *Random Oper. Stoch. Equ.* **3(2)** (1995), 113–124.

[Pr14] E. Priola. Stochastic flow for SDEs with jumps and irregular drift term. Preprint 2014. Available at http://arxiv.org/pdf/1405.2575v1.pdf

[PT69] W.E. Pruitt, S.J. Taylor, The potential kernel and hitting probabilities for the general stable process in $\mathbb{R}^n$. *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.* **146** (1969), 299–321.

[St10a] P. Sztonyk. Estimates of tempered stable densities. *J. Theor. Probab.* **23(1)** (2010) 127–147.

[St10b] P. Sztonyk. Regularity of harmonic functions for anisotropic fractional Laplacians. *Math. Nachr.* **283(2)** (2010), 289–311.

[St11] P. Sztonyk. Transition density estimates for jump Lévy processes. *Stoch. Proc. Appl.* **121** (2011), 1245–1265.

[Ts70] M. Tsuchiya. On a small drift of Cauchy process. *J. Math. Kyoto Univ.* **10** (1970), 475–492.

[Ts73] M. Tsuchiya. On some perturbations of stable processes. *Proc. Second Japan-USSR Symp. on Probability Theory, Lecture Notes in Math.* **330** (1973), 490–497.

[Ts74] Ch. Tsutsumi. The fundamental solution for a degenerate parabolic pseudo-differential operator. *Proc. Japan Acad.* **50** (1974), 11–15.

[W07] T. Watanabe, Asymptotic estimates of multi-dimensional stable densities and their applications. *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.* **359(6)** (2007), 2851–2879.

[Zo86] V. M. Zolotarev. *One-dimensional stable distributions.* AMS, Providence, 1986.